

THE  
CONDUCT  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN,  
VINDICATED  
AGAINST THE CALUMNIES OF  
Foreign Enemies and Domestic Conspirators ;  
SINCE THE ÆRA OF THE COMMENCEMENT  
OF  
THE PRESENT WAR  
WITH  
FRANCE.

---

By CHARLES TWEEDIE, Junr.

---

*Non possum oblivisci meam hanc esse patriam.*

Cic.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOHN STOCKDALE, PICCADILLY.

---

1799.



TO  
 THE RIGHT HONOURABLE  
 LORD MINTO.  
 THIS first Production of  
 a very juvenile Pen is most respect-  
 fully inscribed; as a slender but faith-  
 ful Testimony of the Gratitude  
 which is felt by the author, for the  
 Friendship with which his Lordship  
 has the Goodness and Condescen-  
 sion to honour him.



—————

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOHN STODOLSKY, RICHMOND.

1793.

TO  
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE  
*L O R D M I N T O,*

THIS first Production of  
a very juvenile Pen is most respectfully inscribed; as a slender but faithful Testimony of the Gratitude which is felt by its Author, for the Friendship with which his Lordship has the Goodness and Condescension to honour him.

# INTRODUCTION

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LEO D. MINTO

the eye of a judicious mind is a  
usually station to a place of residence and  
of the part of a country to pay as far  
a very juvenile Pen is not to be  
fully described; as a leader of the  
ful testimony of the Gratitude  
which is not by its Author, for the  
friendship with which the friendship  
has the Goodness and Goodness  
and deserving her duties, but especially to  
avoid being carried by the wind and  
little calamities of those whose light  
g

## INTRODUCTION.

---

**T**HERE are certain periods in which the eye of an inquisitive mind is naturally anxious to take a retrospective glance of the past state of a country, to pry as far as is allowed to its share of observation into the womb of futurity, and by mature and impartial consideration, to endeavour to discover her true and actual situation. It is, however, indispensably necessary, that the most vigilant caution be employed, not only to shun the delusions of an implicit attachment to any particular party, who may find an *interest* in exaggerating her prosperity, and denying her disasters, but zealously to avoid being ensnared by the malignant and subtle calumnies of those, whose highest

B

pleasure



pleasure seems to be to decry her ability, and to depreciate her resources; and by that means to sink her, should she be already involved in difficulties, to the lowest gulf of desperation and ruin. There are men amongst us, who, biaſſed by perverted and anti-patriotic prejudice, are determined, by under-rating the powers of their own country, and by magnifying thoſe of their enemies, to raiſe in the minds of their countrymen that ſpirit of deſpondency, which, in proportion to the ignorance and weakneſs of its imbibers, acquires ſufficient ſtrength to take root, and to produce all the horrors of diſmay and deſpair. Theſe men, who, with a ſeeming triumph, proclaim that the political territories of their country are replete with “ antres vaſt and deſerts idle,” are extremely hoſtile to the ſtate, inas-much as they invite and provoke foreign attack by their clamorous and malicious declamations on our inability to reſiſt it.

To

To a mind firmly resolved to shun the equally dangerous rocks of blind partiality, and malignant disaffection, I cannot conceive an opportunity more extensive than the present state of our affairs seems capable of affording. I shall, therefore, endeavour to form as just an estimate of the present state of Great Britain as my mediocrity of talent will permit me, equally unbiaſſed by party opinion and intereſted motives.—Tros, Tyriufve mihi nullo diſcrimine agetur.

The principal and moſt prominent feature in the preſent face of affairs is, doubtleſs, the war in which we have been ſo long engaged : various are the opinions of men concerning the propriety or impropriety of its origin. While ſome loudly attach to this country all the blame of its commencement; others, on the contrary, firmly deny ſo ſerious a charge, and endeavour to refute ſo grave an accuſation. Upon queſtions like

this, involving so many intricate and momentous points, there frequently arises a diversity of sentiment; every man being naturally inclined to consider them in that light, in which they most intimately affect himself. But, although this is the general, it is far from being the proper, line of conduct; for upon a subject of so much importance to the welfare of humanity, and when the interests and even existence of so many are at stake, I cannot but think, that the only true criterion by which an affair of such stupendous magnitude can be judged, is deliberately to weigh the distresses which it has already occasioned, and to reflect upon the probable disasters which might have accrued had it not been undertaken.—This is the test by which every war should be examined. To none is it more applicable than to the present. And although I am aware that it is a question which has been frequently agitated in the British Senate, still  
it

it cannot but have been observed, that it has not always been discussed with a gravity and calmness due to its unparalleled importance; and although a private individual would not pretend, and cannot be expected, to treat the subject with equal ability, yet he may, perhaps, be able to weigh it with more dispassionate moderation and unprejudiced impartiality, than can be expected to prevail in the fervor of debate, and amidst the conflicts of rival statesmen.

Upon reflecting on the grand question of the origin of this momentous war, every man naturally wishes to discover, by the testimony of facts too clear to be misrepresented, whether it was provoked by the most insolent aggression, and imposed upon us by the most imperious necessity; or whether the Minister of this country, seized with an unjustifiable desire “ to busy giddy minds  
“ with



“ with foreign quarrel,” plunged us headlong into the horrors of destructive war.

It is, therefore, the design of the following pages to prove, beyond the power of refutation, that to the unwarrantable hostility of France alone the present war is to be ascribed. This is followed by an examination whether its prosecution has, to this country, been productive of disaster and disgrace; which is also succeeded by a demonstration, that our attempts at negotiation were rendered abortive solely by the inordinate ambition and inveterate rancour of the enemy. Reflections arising from these several considerations will close our vindication.

The following Sections will comprise the subject of discussion :

Section I.—The wanton aggressions of France productive of the war.

Section

Section II.—Charges of disaster and disgrace considered.

Section III.—Attempts at Negotiation frustrated by France.

Section IV.—General Reflections emanating from the whole.

Some strictures upon Mr. Erskine's "*Causes and Consequences of the present War with France,*" will find a place under the corresponding Sections. I deem it, at the same time, necessary to remark, that nothing like a regular reply to that work is intended by the following observations. Such a task is, indeed, rendered totally unnecessary by the able answers which it has already received; and perhaps some apology may be thought due to the Public for presuming to make any comments upon a production which, notwithstanding the industry employed to procure it celebrity among the *sovereign people* (which has, I fear, been the cause

cause of considerable mischief) is now sunk into merited oblivion. The necessity, however, of removing all the rubbish which party malice has so industriously heaped together to conceal from public view plain and stubborn facts, has alone induced me to notice some of the *principal* charges (the contradictory and unsupported assertions which compose the far greater part of his publication are, indeed, self-destructive) alleged against Great Britain by one of the most industrious of her accusers.

I must own too, that the peculiarly urgent\* necessity of proving, beyond the power of rational contradiction, the innocence of Great Britain, at this momentous crisis, when she has no alternative from

\* “ *Quantam vim habeat in bellis justitiæ conscientia,*” says Grotius, “ *passim ostendunt historiarum Scriptores, qui victoriam sæpè huic causæ præcipue ascribunt.*”

speedy ruin, but to exert herself with redoubled energy for the salvation of the whole civilized world from the deadly grasp of atheistic and despotic France, and the hope of terminating all controversy upon a subject which intimately involves our most sacred rights and dearest interests, could alone have emboldened me to raise my feeble voice in defence of my country, and to expose the calumnies of her bitterest enemies.





# CONDUCT,

&c.

---

## SECTION I.

### WANTON AGGRESSIONS OF FRANCE PRODUCTIVE OF THE WAR.

**I**T is confidently asserted by men, whose promulgated opinions naturally have an important influence on the public mind, that the war, in which Great Britain finds herself at present engaged, was brought on entirely by the flagrant impropriety of her conduct: it is generally, by them, attributed to her interference with the internal affairs of France; and to her having wantonly instigated Holland to hostilities with that power. If either of these most tremendous charges can be clearly proved, it necessarily follows, that the conduct of Great Britain

Britain was most injudicious and criminal ; and it cannot, surely, be thought a sacrifice of time, to examine into the grounds of such awful accusations.—To ascertain the justice of these allegations a recurrence to the diplomatic correspondence which passed between the countries is absolutely indispensable. Before, however, we proceed to this examination, and in order to have an accurate view of the situation of the two powers at the æra of the commencement of hostilities, a cursory survey of the affairs which have produced such unparalleled effects upon the whole commonwealth of Europe will not be thought totally unnecessary.—The destruction of the most ancient and powerful civilized monarchy of this western world, must be supposed naturally to have occasioned the greatest alarms to every neighbouring state. It has not been unusual for surrounding powers spontaneously to lend their assistance to regulate prevailing disputes, and thereby to restore individual peace and general security.—Such was the assistance afforded by Elizabeth of England to Henry of Navarre. Such was the alliance entered into by the English and Dutch with the Emperor Charles the Sixth, for the succession

of



of Spain. Such was, in fact, the conduct exercised by the French themselves when they intermeddled with the affairs of Germany. History is not barren of instances, in which such interference with foreign policy has been productive of general advantage. It is not, however, essential to our purpose to enquire, whether it was the interest or duty of Great Britain to make a similar interposition; but it will not be denied, that the omission could solely have originated in a desire to remain perfectly neutral, and not to intermeddle with affairs in which she thought herself not immediately concerned. Such conduct was an indubitable proof of an ardent love of peace, and, consequently, calls for our approbation and praise.

The year 1791 was fruitful in most dire calamities to France. Her orders were destroyed—her priesthood was impiously abolished and cruelly plundered—her nobility hunted into emigration, and robbed of their property—her civil power wantonly annihilated—her monarch with his family treated with most ignominious outrage—in a word, her government usurped by  
a most



a most licentious and rebellious rabble. The complaints of the injured sovereign to the self-created power, styling itself the National Assembly, gave birth to a circular letter, which these despots compelled him to sanction with his name, hoping, by this paltry artifice, to impose his forced concurrence, upon surrounding nations, as the offspring of spontaneous approbation. This letter was sent by M. Montmorin to all the European Courts, proclaiming the nature and principles of that heterogeneous mixture of pretended benevolence and real despotism, which was varnished over by the delusive and commanding name of the New \* Constitution of France.

This delusion was succeeded by more atrocious indignities—by the flight to Montmedi—by the imprisonment, and threatened assassination, of the Royal Family of France—by the farcical revision of their infant constitution, and

\* In justice to the memory of an unfortunate Prince it must be acknowledged, that this manifesto was avowed by him to have been the effect of force on his person and usurpation of his power; in his flight, which followed soon after, he left behind him a declaration in which he expressly *disowns* and *disannuls* the new Constitution.

by

by its involuntary acceptance by the King. It was not, however, the dread of personal danger that extorted from the mild and virtuous Louis this most fatal act.—No! His noble soul would have spurned at their menaces, and calmly have smiled at the tempest which assailed with fury his unsheltered head. Though scowling rebellion had exhausted upon him her fund of burning scoffs and agonizing revilements, patient serenity graced his countenance——

——Princely counsel in his face yet shone  
Majestic though in ruin.

——But when he saw the uplifted poignard threaten with instantaneous destruction all that he held most dear, when delusive hopes of instant repentance on the part of his riotous people were, at the same time, artfully held out, and the most solemn declarations made, that universal tranquillity depended upon his immediate acquiescence in their wishes, a ray of hope beamed across his distracted heart, and that tender solicitude for the happiness of his people which had ever animated his conduct, prompted him instantly to agree to their treacherous desires.—He signed the Constitution. The act was announced

nounced to us by a second letter from the before mentioned instrument of ochlocracy. As such official communications could not have been sent but with a view of knowing our sentiments regarding the nature and elements of that system which they avowed to have been created for the imitation and happiness of all civilized nations, and for the admiration of unborn ages, it naturally afforded us an opportunity of expressing them. Great Britain, however, notwithstanding she saw a wild and impious sect usurp the dominion of France and maintain it by the combined terrors of proscription and massacre, still wisely restrained those expressions of indignation and horror which such scenes naturally excited, and prudently determined to behold in silence the tempest which was raging with such implacable fury. Not availing herself of the right, to which, by these unsought manifestations, her attention was directly courted, (even had no such right existed before, and been acknowledged by all the writers upon the law of nations) of examining the nature and principles of the vaunted constitution; she contented herself with testifying the lively interest she would always feel for the happiness of the King, his family



family and his subjects. Thus it is obvious, that their malignant designs to open, by these infectious declarations, the channel of revolution in this and in all other countries\*, were retaliated only by benevolence and friendship. From this moderate and pacific conduct it will be found that she never swerved.

Owing to various circumstances, which it is foreign to our purpose now to examine, the continental powers did not behold with indifference the disasters which were ravaging territories so little remote from their own. Germany and Prussia thought it not beneath their consideration to interfere with affairs which threatened destruction to their own Governments, to endeavour to tranquillize a nation, suffering through the freaks of a licentious mob, and to restore a deposed monarch to the throne of his ancestors, which he had ever adorned by his philanthropy, and regard for the happiness of his people.

\* This is sufficiently proved by the enthusiastic declaration of the National Assembly, that their notification was a splendid example of a great King proclaiming afar the liberty of all people.



The sanguinary rulers of France, dreading an end to their usurpation by the projected league of these neighbouring Potentates, again had recourse to the captive Louis as the tool to delude Great Britain, and to induce her to assist them in the preservation of assailed despotism.

A Minister, notoriously in the interest of the faction, though apparently under the direction of the powerless King, was consequently dispatched to this Court. It is at this moment, therefore, that the subject under our immediate consideration commences.

M. Chauvelin was appointed Minister Plenipotentiary from Louis XVI. to this Court, and began his diplomatic charge, as will be seen upon a reference to the official \* correspondence, by informing us of the war which had broke out between France and Germany.

\* This correspondence, being accessible to every one, is too well known to admit of any forgery upon it to pass undetected, or its fabricators to escape without merited obloquy. To such important parts as tend to illustrate the subject in discussion, I shall occasionally refer, with a fidelity which, I trust, will afford no room for reprehension.

It

It is unnecessary to dwell here upon the reasons which had produced that rupture; as our object now is not to be the umpire between foreign disputes. It is but candid, however, to confess, that towards this country the French Minister's note breathed sentiments of the most perfect peace;—it professed a determination never to interfere with the affairs of neutral countries—(professions which, it will appear, they soon disgraced, but which never would have been violated by the orders of their virtuous Sovereign;) its chief object, however, was to require that, in conformity to the fourth article of the Treaty of Navigation and Commerce of September, 1786, his Britannic Majesty should publish his prohibition to exercise any hostilities against France. Lord Grenville's answer, prudently abstaining from passing judgment upon the conduct of either of the contending parties, was expressive of deep regret to learn that a war had broke out between two powers with whom Great Britain was upon terms of friendship. In obedience to the request of his most Christian Majesty the stipulations of the above mentioned treaty were most exactly fulfilled. His Majesty instantly issued his proclamation to that effect.

As at this time much fermentation existed in the public mind of this country, owing to the contagion of the recent revolution in France, and as large bodies of turbulent and seditious men had visibly entered into a conspiracy to undermine our invaluable Constitution, in the hope of producing similar disasters to those which were ravaging a neighbouring country; as it was likewise but too well known that the most animating encouragement and promises of assistance had been given to them by that horde of levellers and outlaws, whose hands were still red with the blood of their own Monarchy, his Majesty, with the advice of his Privy Council, issued his proclamation of the 21st of May, as a measure of national security. Concerning this proclamation, however, it is sufficient to observe, that *if it alluded* to the designs of France, it adverted only to projects which have since been wickedly tried in almost every country in Europe, and been unfortunately triumphant in some of the most pacific and unoffending of them. As far as it relates to the internal state of Great Britain, it then only warned her against those who have since proved themselves her bitterest enemies.

Mr.



Mr. Erskine, indeed, takes occasion, on this proclamation, to vindicate, or at least to extenuate, the conduct of certain societies who are generally supposed to have been the objects of it, and whose views have since been so completely ascertained by dark machinations in one kingdom, and by open rebellion in another, that any reply to any of their advocates may well be deemed superfluous. I cannot, however, restrain the remark, that had this Proclamation stood in need of any defence, it had been abundantly, though perhaps involuntarily, (unfortunately, it must be confessed, for the consistency of his argument) supplied by Mr. Erskine himself.

M. Chauvelin, in his letter of the 18th June, assured Lord Grenville of the happiness which the French King (he was still apparently kept in possession of nominal and barren authority) felt from "the sentiments of humanity, of justice and of peace, which are so clearly manifested in his answer." This will be found to have been a most flimsy duplicity to allure Great Britain into the broils which threatened calamity to one quarter or the other. He assures us,



“ that the tranquillity of Europe would never  
 “ be disturbed if *France* and *England* would  
 “ *unite* in order to preserve it.” This dexterity  
 on their part failed of success. Their designs  
 were but too manifest. Though convinced of  
 the duty which is sometimes imposed upon a  
 country to interpose in the unjust aggression  
 committed upon another; Great Britain still  
 thought it behoved her to regard in silence the  
 passing scene, till she saw any unlawful violence  
 assail either country, or till at least, she was re-  
 quested by *both* parties to become the arbitress  
 in the pending dispute. Any other conduct  
 must necessarily have violated that strict neutra-  
 lity she had resolved to maintain.

A circumstance, however, soon occurred,  
 which could not permit his Majesty to remain  
 any longer an indifferent or silent spectator.—  
 A circumstance no less than the open and vio-  
 lent deposition of Louis XVI. even from that  
 degraded and pretended kingship which the de-  
 stroyers of the French monarchy had for a time  
 granted him. The force and dignity of the  
 Crown having been for some time trampled on,  
 and all its power having been ravished by a fac-  
 tious

tious mob, the unformed and terrific conspiracy which had reared its ghastly head from the ashes of all human and divine law, still preserved itself in usurped and despotic dominion by the united terrors of fire and sword. Its leaders at length came to the cruel resolution to strip him of even the poor remnant of those rights of sovereignty which had been allotted to him by that constitution so stedfastly and triumphantly declared to be the free will of the whole nation.

Louis the sixteenth having no longer authority as King of the French, and consequently the powers granted to our Ambassador being no longer valid, his Majesty deemed it prudent to recal him from Paris. Sentiments to this effect were conveyed (in the absence of Lord Grenville) by Mr. Dundas to Lord Gower, who was expressly enjoined in all the conversations that might ensue previously to his departure, not to neglect every opportunity of declaring, that "his Majesty meant to observe the principles of  
"neutrality in every thing which regarded the  
"internal affairs of France."

As the continuance of our Ambassador would have been an indirect sanction and approbation of these violent excesses, his recall seems the only alternative which could prove the fidelity of our professions of neutrality. It would have been highly impolitic in this country, blessed with the parental care of a mild and virtuous Sovereign, and experimentally feeling the real blessing of a regal Government, to behold with supine indifference a neighbouring Monarchy expiring under the hands of merciless assassins. Would it not have been a tacit approval of those traitorous crimes, to maintain that intercourse with France we preserved under a flourishing Monarchy? Would not an acquiescence in their disorderly conduct have been a strong encouragement to the seditious in this country, who, it was but too evident, had been deeply tainted with the revolutionary mania from France? Was it not highly probable that a free intercourse between the two nations would, at that awful crisis, have cherished into life the embryos of insurrection, which wanted only the sunshine of fostering contiguity? These considerations compel us to acknowledge the recalling of our Ambassador,



Ambassador, a measure dictated at once by unoffending policy and equitable wisdom. Nor was this conduct the smallest interference with the domestic affairs of France. Though my neighbour should have conducted himself in a manner which constrained me, in policy and personal safety, to withdraw myself from his contaminating society, and to behave myself towards him with reserve, he would not, surely, be warranted in his presumption to dictate to me my independent conduct, and, should I appear unwilling to receive him with former familiarity, he would not, certainly, be authorised by justice to treat me as an inveterate foe. So far, indeed, was our conduct from being regarded by France as inimical, that, although she "regretted our having recalled our Ambassador," still, convinced from experience of the truth of our professions of strict neutrality, she could not refrain from assuring us, "that she saw in it the result of an intention, wisely considered and formally expressed, not to meddle with the interior arrangements of France."

This measure was nothing more than a firm determination to maintain a cool reserve, till  
France,



France, sensible of the fatal impropriety of her conduct, should return to that state of civilization which could justify and deserve the renewal of communion. Its seasonable propriety was amply proved by our finding, in a short time after, that the National Convention of France, not satisfied with having sown the seeds of revolt in every neighbouring nation, and fearful that they might perish unproductive for want of proper culture, adopted an expedient which they flattered themselves would quicken them into instantaneous and vigorous luxuriance. It certainly removed all doubt respecting the extent and enormity of their designs. They passed, on the 19th of November, 1792, a decree which offered voluntary assistance to the rebellious of every nation. It most unequivocally announced, that they would, at a moment's warning, pour in legions of marauders to batter down the pillars of every regular government. The puny attempts they afterwards made to palliate the guilt of this decree (which all their prevarications could not conceal or remove) are at once contemptible and useless.—It had passed.—All the powers on earth could not recall it. Their plan of “spreading every where the flames of revolt”

revolt" had been divulged by a leading demagogue.\* The British promoters of sedition had been affectionately received in the bosom of the Convention, and † cherished by the most flattering and animating speeches, at the very instant it was passing this infernal decree. Could England then doubt its object? Was it not sent abroad for the direct purpose, and in the malignant hope, of stirring up rebellion in every country? ‡ Did they declare or ever intimate that

\* Briffot.

† When these virtuous and patriotic missionaries congratulated the Convention on the abolition of monarchy, the President politely answered, "that he hoped soon to return the compliment, *on the establishment of a National Convention in England.*"

‡ To shew what little reliance could be placed upon their assurances of respecting the independence of other nations, one example will abundantly suffice. In the puerile hope of deluding Us into deadly repose they solemnly affirmed, that "France would not impose laws upon any one;" a few days before, however, they expressly declared (in the decree of 15th December) "that *She would treat as enemies* the people who, refusing or renouncing liberty and equality, were desirous of recalling or entering into an accommodation with their *Prince* and privileged casts." Every pains was, indeed, taken to promulgate the dangerous doctrine, that every government, not being a democracy, is an

\* See Paper from M. Chauvelin to Lord Grenville, dated 13th January, 1793.

usurpation.

that neutral countries were exempt from its fatal operation ? No ! Its object was undisguised, and its nature dreadful. Out of the gloomy caverns of Gallic Pandemonium issued a voice which roared with hideous yell, " Woe to the " inhabitants of earth." Our well-grounded apprehensions are not rendered ridiculous by the assertions of Mr. Erskine, that this " decree, and " the system of which it was a part, *existed only " upon paper*, and in the inflammatory speeches " of enthusiastic men, until *confederated Europe " began the actual and forcible fraternization of " France.*"\* We would tell him, that its mere existence upon paper was no extenuation of its evil. Had not the most sanguine hopes of *practical* utility been entertained, they never would have published a description of its nature when viewed *theoretically*. It could not have answered any end. To suppose that its ghastly outline would have been sketched *upon paper* with-

usurpation. " La Convention Nationale, après avoir entendu le rapport de ses comités de finances, de la guerre, et diplomatiques réunis, fidelle *au principe de souveraineté de peuples qui ne lui permet pas de reconnoître aucune institution qui y porte atteinte,*" &c. &c.—Decret sur le rapport de Cambon, 13 Decembre, 1792.



out a real intention to finish it with all the richness of colour, and striking effect, that blood can display, were to betray too gross an ignorance of the nature and disposition of the French Convention. We would tell him, that it was a phantom of so terrific a guise, and of so baneful a nature, that it shook, for a time, the thrones of Europe to their foundation; and that had not its deadly purpose been instantly defeated by the potent enchantment of enlightened loyalty, God only knows to what length it would have carried its infernal designs:—that it had planted its foot in the bosom of this country, which he cannot accuse of having any concern with “confederated Europe in its forcible fraternization of France,” and made so deep an impression as to require the most strenuous exertions of heroic loyalty entirely to efface and repair. Nor was the dismay inseparable from this decree to be allayed by the shallow quibble of the French Ministry “that it could not have any application,”

\* All *argument*, on our part, upon the *possibility* of applying this decree, is, in truth, rendered in some degree unnecessary, by the notoriety of the circumstance which gave birth to it. Some insurgents in the bailiwick of Darmstadt, belonging to the Duke of Deux-Ponts (who was at peace with  
France)



“tion, unless in the *single case* in which the *general will* of a nation, clearly and unequivocally expressed, should call the French nation to its assistance and fraternity.” This argument is, however, answerable in a few words; and it will undoubtedly be thought an object of sympathetic regret, that the foundation, upon which they flattered themselves they had built an impregnable fortress, should consist of but shallow and wasting sand, and, consequently, that their tower of strength and security may be blown down by the slightest breath of the most feeble logician. It did not probably occur to

France) had planted the tree of liberty, and displayed the tri-coloured cockade. No sooner had the tidings of this revolt, and that the Duke was advancing to crush it, reached Paris, than Rhul, a member of the Convention, moved, that “Those people who wish to fraternize with Us, are under the protection of the French Republic.” This inflammatory motion was instantly adopted, and this nefarious decree immediately passed. To shew the facility with which this decree might be *acted upon*, (disdaining the ceremony of an invitation from the *general will*) a French army was dispatched to revolutionize the dominions of the pacific Duke, who, to escape the bayonets of sanguinary enthusiasts, fled for refuge to the opposite bank of the Rhine. It must be thus obvious that all their attempts to deny the possibility of realizing this decree, except in the case which they cite, serve only to illustrate the enormity of their insolence.

these

these sage legislators, that the case which they had ransacked all the stores of their ingenuity to invent, and which they deemed incontestable, was the *very case* in which their argument was of no avail—the very instance in which their assistance would not be wanted. Their decree, say they, can be supposed applicable only to the *single case* in which the *general will* of a whole nation requires their assistance. Now as collateral aid is requisite *only* to assist the *weaker* of *two* conflicting parties, in order to render it equal, at least, if not superior, to the individually stronger, when a nation is unanimous, and is guided in its affairs by the *general will* of the people, it stands in no need of foreign succour. Where no difference exists there cannot be contest. All external interference, therefore, is, of necessity, superfluous and offensive. But to give them another chance of escape, let us admit, that the word *general will* has another signification than *perfect unanimity*, let us grant that it signifies also the *majority* of a people: let us then see of what advantage to them our lenity will be productive. The stronger of two contending bodies by possessing intrinsically a superiority of strength is not in want of external support.

support. If, indeed, help were called for by either, it would, unquestionably, be by the *weaker* of the two parties : which will not be affirmed, I trust, by the most frontless lexicographer of sophistry to be the meaning of the word \* *general will*.

To consider this decree in another point of view. If it could have been susceptible solely of their pretended construction, they would not have been at the trouble of launching it into the world ; since they could not have had any prospect of its success. It was not to be expected that surrounding nations, who beheld with horror “ a vast, tremendous, unformed spectre arise “ from the tomb of the murdered monarchy of “ France,” would become so enamoured of the ghastly monster as to have languished for its embrace : though numbers might have been so

\* I understand this word *now* in its *vulgar*, in contradistinction to its political, meaning : since, as this decree was sent forth by France, and as it would have been acted upon by this country, (had it unfortunately been realized) agreeably to the *former* idea, it would not be strictly logical to reason upon it in any other light. It is frankly confessed by Cambon, that the Convention always recognized by the word *people*, the *multitude*, not the *orders* of citizens, which inhabit a nation.

fascinated



fascinated with the ideal charms of this hideous loathsome phantom, as to have courted a hug in its poisonous arms, it was not at *that* time within the range of probability that a *whole nation* would have been so fatally insane. Was this the reward due to Great Britain for her wisdom and virtue in refraining from all interference with the affairs of France,—to announce to her unnatural sons that if they chose to lift their murderous arm against their venerable parent, they might rely upon their sanction and assistance: that, if they had any inclination to amuse themselves with the speculations of “correcting” their government or of \* changing its form in toto,

\* By my reprehension of the vicious attempts of France to seduce Britons from their affection to their invaluable Constitution, I would not wish it to be imagined, that I invariably acknowledge the doctrine of the immutability of government. To deny that it is the inherent indefeasible right of an enlightened people to alter the form of an *oppressive* government, were at once puerile and absurd. Such a denial would be to consecrate the frauds by which the government of France has been audaciously usurped. The demolition of this hideous system, by the slaves of the directorial despots, would be not only justifiable, but highly laudable; and the deliverance of themselves from the ignominious servitude by which they have been so long polluted, would certainly greatly tend to palliate the atrocity of guilt which has long characterised their conduct. In such cases of

D

bloody



toto, or for any other object" (a term sufficiently vague and extensive, it must be confessed, for all the refinements of ingenious innovation) they would feel happy in affording them every aid to pull

bloody despotism is this alteration of political systems to be justified. It must be observed, however, that the right of changing a long established tyrannical form of government, springs *solely* from the authority of the *general will*, clearly and maturely expressed, uncontrolled by force, and unbiassed by corruption. As no word has been more artfully misrepresented, and seems more misunderstood, it may not, perhaps, be useless to remark, that by the word *general will*, it is not to be understood the wishes of the whole multitude, of which a nation is composed, *numerically* considered. This is its *civil* acceptation. Its *political* meaning is far different. As the former signification is favourable to insurrection, it has always been studiously inculcated by the British seditionists, and by the French usurpers. It must be observed, however, that as a nation consists but of two *abstract* orders—the rich, and the poor—the *unanimous* consent, or, should that not be obtainable, the *predominant* wishes collected from EACH of these *orders*, constitute the *general will* of a people. If, indeed, the contrary were the case, the product of such a collection must be a *partial*, not a *general*, will: and, as the poor of every country are the more numerous body, by *them* must be understood the word *people*. The danger of such a doctrine is obvious. For if mere heterogeneous numbers possessed, in any case, this imprescriptible right, an immense mob rushing suddenly upon a province or city, must be considered its rightful proprietors—its lawful possessors. It is evident, therefore, that abstract numbers never can constitute the PEOPLE *politically* considered. Should it be argued,

pull down their well-compacted system of policy, and to erect, on its site, a theatre, after the exact model of their own, for the public exhibition of every vice.

They

argued, that, as numbers generate strength, their voice is too immense to be resisted, and that consequently they form the people; we would answer, that this remark is perfectly irrelevant to the question, since, as our subject is the consideration of *right*, it is to be decided by the criterion of *equity*, not by that of *force*. The pure universality, or the majority of wishes equitably derived from each of the *orders*, by which a state is composed, is *alone* to be esteemed the real choice of the people. It is this which proclaims the corporate mind. It is this which justifies the subversion of a despotic form of government, and which legitimates the institution of a new frame of polity.

In the case of France, for instance, no man will be so infatuated as to suppose, that the revolution was the free choice of the majority of the higher, as well as of the lower, orders of the people. Had that opinion been formally taken, the total abolition of royalty would never have been effected. The noblesse never could have assented to the ignominious degradation of its rank, and the cruel confiscation of its wealth; nor would a well-disposed commonalty have been delighted with the extinction of its liberties, and the plunder of its property; with the demolition of all law, and the establishment of a system of massacre and rapine. But the band of subtle and desperate conspirators, to whom the world is indebted for the only *complete* revolution which it ever saw, were perfectly well aware that so equitable a measure was directly hostile to their views, and, consequently, having previously seduced the soldiery, and poisoned, by their seditious doctrines, the minds of a licentious

They are peculiarly unhappy too in their selection of an analogy to support the sophistry of their argument. They tell us that the Dutch were not seditious when they formed the resolution

populace, rushed upon their prey before it had time to fly to a protection. In the case of the illustrious Prince of Orange, had the inhabitants of Great Britain been counted like sheep in a market-place, *by the head*, I am not confident that he would have been firmly fixed on the British throne. Such a fluctuating and capricious voice might, perhaps, have greeted him one day, and despised him the next. The profound statesmen of those days well knew the danger of so spurious a census. The rightful people therefore made the election: and the majority of the aristocracy, as also the majority of the democracy, (whose wishes were expressed through their representatives) unalterably stamped this happy choice with the public seal of national approbation.

I acknowledge, with grateful exultation, that it is to the *general will* of the British Nation exercised in the glorious office of dethroning James the Second, that I am indebted for the blessings of a constitution I now enjoy. It is, indeed, indispensably necessary to discriminate between the virtuous exertions of the promoters of the English revolution of 1688, in the deposition of a tyrant who had formed a plot against the liberty of his country; and the wild sanguinary struggles of the founders of the French Revolution of 1789 in the usurpation of uncontrollable power—a power grasped by a band of furious atheists and desperate conspirators clothed with the specious, but stolen, armour of the “*general will*,” to pull down the pillars of a government under whose dome virtuous men enjoyed rational



solution of shaking off the yoke of Spain ; and that it was not reputed a crime in Henry the IVth or Elizabeth of England, to listen to them. Most indisputably not !—Upon that hypothesis

we

tional freedom, and to erect a rotten fabric, in whose early ruins they find a retreat to divide the spoils of ravaged empires. The former built the Temple of Liberty. The latter dug the Cave of Infurrection, whose religion is Atheism, and whose laws are despotism, and massacre, and from whose pestilential jaws the emissaries of rapine and revolt are dispatched to destroy the real liberty of every state.

I wish distinctly to affirm, that in cases similar to those of France and Holland (the wanton demolition of the ancien regime I allude to) I deny the *right* of a people to alter the form of their government. I cannot certainly recognize, in the usurped authority of a reigning faction, the just right to change ad libitum their regular government, and, by that means, triumphantly to tyrannize over a cowardly, deluded and embruted people, whose voice, if not stifled by the dread of judicial and legalized murder, would rise in loud clamours against the usurpation and despotism of their rulers.

To illustrate the truth of these observations, and to demonstrate the fatal ease with which designing men riot in the most wanton outrages, when dressed in the borrowed feathers of popular approbation ; it is necessary only to remark that, had not the usurpers of the French Government invariably disguised their licentious freaks under the mask of " the general will," they never could have perpetrated their unheard-of atrocities, nor revelled in excesses, at which Europe has incessantly trembled with indignant astonishment. Conscious of the advantages of this artifice, they



we perfectly accord with them :—but do they mean to aver that the two transactions were analogous ? It will, on the contrary, be found that their illumination gives no real light, and that their similitude conveys no true likeness. It

grasped it as a talisman which, by affording them protection from the shackles of responsibility, made them rise superior to all controul. This dexterity was faithfully and forcibly described by an enlightened orator, “ *l’Opinion publique*,” says M. de Cazalès, “ dont l’Assemblée Nationale n’a cessé de s’investir à tenu lieu du Pouvoir Exécutif.”

Some consolation for past calamity and hope of future tranquillity may, however, be derived from the reflection, that this self-created domination has generally been short-lived : and that each aspiring Fiesco, whose boundless ambition excited him to “ ride in the whirlwind and direct the storm,” has soon been seen to tumble from his ærial feat, and to fall into the gulph of instantaneous destruction.

This feigned respect for the *general will* of a nation has been the perpetual charm by means of which they have dazzled the eyes and deceived the senses of every deluded people who have unfortunately become the wretched dupes of their wily and cruel artifice. The instant they fall into the regicide snare, the cloak is thrown off, and this pretended reverence displays itself in its real character—the merciless and sanguinary reviler of besotted credulity. A more striking instance of this bloody hypocrisy is not to be found than in the conduct of France towards Belgium. “ *Au mépris de la volonté universelle des Belges*,” says M. Mallet du Pan, “ la République Française, abusant jusqu’au sacrilège de son impie intolérance, a poursuivi avec le fer et le feu l’extirpation de toute religion dans les Pays Bas.”

was

was an abhorrence of slavery which induced those enlightened sovereigns to sanction the exertion of a people, in freeing themselves from the unjust cruelties of the bigot Philip II., aggravated by the barbarities of the Duke of Alva; barbarities which forced the inhabitants of the Low Countries to shake off the Spanish yoke, and under the conduct of William the First, Prince of Orange, to form the Republic of the United Provinces:—a Republic, whose basis being moderation and wisdom, was justly esteemed one of the wisest and most faultless Commonwealths upon earth. It was to involve all other countries in the horrors and miseries inseparable from the ruinous dynasty tyrannizing in France, that she vomited a decree in the hopes of gaining proselytes to a system, supported by terror and by force, and which declared open hostilities to social order and to all religion.—A decree which, by opening the flood gates of revolt, threatened with destruction the whole civilized world—a decree which is, (by anticipation) condemned by Vattel in the most pointed terms. \* “It is a *violation*,” says he, “of the law of nations, to persuade those sub-

\* Vattel. Book II. Chap. IV. § 56.

“jects to revolt who actually obey their Sovereign, though they may complain of his government.” How enormously then must the offence be aggravated, when the attempt is made towards a people, who, so far from complaining of their government, know it to be the mildest and wisest under heaven, and who consequently love it with a sincere and merited affection; and who adore their Prince as their father and their friend ! Of such hell-born decrees it may with truth be said—

—*Tristius haud illis monstrum, nec favior ulla  
Pestis, et irâ deûm Stygiis sese extulit undis.*

It will not be denied that after so demonstrative a proof of the hostile designs of the turbulent faction towards this country, it was an indispensable duty to take every precaution to frustrate their success. Was it not natural to endeavour by lawful means to impede the progress of an evil so dangerous to the very existence of the British empire ? Upon this question there cannot be but one opinion. The legislature passed therefore an act, which required that every foreigner (except alien merchants, and foreign

foreign Ministers duly authorized) should declare, upon his arrival in any port of Great Britain, his name and the place of his destination, to the collector of the customs, or chief magistrate, by whom a passport was gratuitously given. As this exaction could not be attended with either difficulty or disgrace to an honest man, but would solely be galling to the lurking desperado in the execution of his clandestine conspiracies, it could not certainly be esteemed vexatious, or oppressive. This act was not the offspring of idle caprice or of groundless suspicion. It was a measure of national safety imperiously called for by the perils of that portentous crisis. It was the sole expedient we could adopt for our preservation from the deep-laid desperate machinations, which had been long planned by foreign and domestic enemies, for the utter destruction of our envied constitution. And notwithstanding the obloquy which was lavished upon it by baffled sedition, (which was, indeed, the greatest proof of its value) experience has abundantly proved the inexpressible obligations we owe it, for our escape from those horrible miseries which, (though well-wishers to the success of these schemes of confiscation and murder, studiously  
and



and clamorously denied their existence) enlightened men, untainted with the poison of Jacobinism, had too great reason to suspect were at that moment hatching to overwhelm us, and which an unrestrained communication with the hot-bed of crimes would have quickly matured into strength to devastate our happy land, and lay in ruins our laws, religion, and liberty. It sprung from that grand and fundamental principle upon which political society itself is founded—*general utility*—*Ipsa utilitas justi propè mater et equi*. It was in fact one of those laws which \* Lord Bacon affirms, from their purity and justice, defy reproach, and challenge admiration,

As soon as the French faction found that we had established quarantine for our protection from the pestilence of insurrection, enmity to a measure so hostile to their views naturally manifested itself. Subtle and fallacious slanders were then to be hurled at an act, which truth and solid argument scorned to assail. They petulantly and falsely asserted, that this most paci-

\* *Lex bona cenferi possit, quæ sit intimatione certa, præcepto justa, executione commoda, cum formâ politiæ congrua, et generans virtutem in subditis.*—De Aug. Scient. lib. VIII. c. 3.

fic measure violated the 4th article of the treaty  
 of navigation and commerce, concluded in 1786,  
 between the two countries, (a treaty which, from  
 the important benefits which it promised to the  
 two nations, and which their rancorous conduct  
 alone could have frustrated, stamps the highest  
 credit upon the commercial talents and political  
 genius of the Ambassador who planned and car-  
 ried it into execution), which stipulates, that  
 “ the subjects and inhabitants of the respective  
 “ dominions of the *two Sovereigns* shall have li-  
 “ berty freely, and securely, without licence or  
 “ passport, general or special, by land or by sea,  
 “ or in any other way, to enter into the king-  
 “ doms, dominions, &c. of either Sovereign,  
 “ situated in Europe, and to return from thence,  
 “ to remain there, or to pass through the same,  
 “ and therein to buy, and purchase, as they  
 “ please, all things necessary for their subsistence  
 “ and use, and they shall mutually be treated  
 “ with all kindness and favour. Provided, how-  
 “ ever, (mark the proviso) that in all these mat-  
 “ ters they behave and conduct themselves con-  
 “ formably to the laws and statutes, and *live with*  
 “ *each other in a friendly manner, and promote re-*  
 “ *ciprocal*

*“ciprocal concord by maintaining a mutual good understanding.”*

As their flimsy aspersions are totally unsupported by truth or argument, we shall content ourselves with affirming, that they had themselves committed the violation, by conducting themselves in a manner which, so far from being “friendly,” was the most *hostile* that any nation could exercise towards another,—that of endeavouring to excite rebellion in a country which had invariably observed the most strict and punctilious neutrality :—in a manner which, so far from being peaceable, evinced, on their part, the most inimical designs, and was, indeed, sufficient provocation for a declaration of war. We declare, nor dread the refutation, that their behaviour, so far from “promoting reciprocal concord,” was naturally calculated to produce the widest breach of amity ;—so far from being adapted to “maintain a mutual good understanding,” it had an immediate and direct tendency to excite, on our part, the most deep-rooted hatred, arising from the strongest conviction, that their conduct could have originated in no other

other view than the destruction of our happiness and independence as a nation.

Had the violation originated with us, we might, perhaps, have had some colour for affirming, that as the treaty was concluded between the *two Sovereigns*, that power being no longer acknowledged in France, the force of the treaty was diminished. Not that we would wish to hazard the senseless assertion, that the mere circumstance of the Sovereign who framed a treaty being no longer in existence, necessarily tends to nullify the once-acknowledged treaty; but we might have contended, that when we saw the French Monarch lawlessly stripped of those functions and prerogatives, by which he framed and concluded that treaty, we had little reason to suppose, that they would look upon themselves any longer bound by a treaty, which was, as they affirm, "burthensome to France." It was undeniably more natural to expect, that they would, in hatred to their Sovereign and all his works, triumphantly annihilate a treaty which was (according to them) "wrested by address and ability from the unskilfulness or from the corruption of a Government they had lately destroyed," and which,



which, being consequently the offspring of tyranny, must have cramped the growth of that liberty they were so tenderly rearing for the happiness of all mankind.

It was scarcely, however, to be expected, that the spirit of evil which had incessantly governed the councils of France should rest here :—

Perplex'd and troubled at his bad success  
The tempter stood, nor had what to reply  
Discover'd in his fraud——

—Enraged to find that their subtle designs were detected, and that Great Britain was awake to the perils that menaced her, they were determined by one desperate effort, to throw off the mask they had so ill-worn, and to burst the chains of decency and justice. Their vows of neutrality were given to the winds.

Anxious to attack the Austrian citadel of Antwerp, the French resolved to carry into immediate effect their projected design, though conscious of its impracticability without a direct infraction of the most solemn treaties, in forcing a passage up the river Scheldt. When they were informed

formed by the Dutch, " that by virtue of treaties the river Scheldt was shut to ships of war," they instantly returned for answer, " that they were determined to enter the Scheldt notwithstanding any opposition of the States-General." Thus they arrogated to themselves the full and uncontrollable power of infringing the most sacred rights, and scorned to make any other apology for this lawless and uncivilized conduct, than *hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas*. Was this the proper reward of strict neutrality? Were the Dutch to be reconciled to this most despotic measure by the audacious assurance " that the opening of the Scheldt was a question decided by reason and justice, of small importance in itself?" We should have been apt to consider the forcible violation of a treaty acknowledged by Europe as indisputable, for more than a century, cannot be called the decision of " reason and justice;" except, indeed, of that reason and justice, which is extracted by the Pseudo-Philosophers from the licentious code of the Rights of Man, and which are only synonymous terms with pretended equality, and lawless rapine. We should have thought that the exclusive sovereignty over this river, ceded to the Dutch by

Philip

Philip IV. of Spain, in 1647, as an *incontestible* proof to Europe of their *independency*; and as part of the price he paid them for their renunciation of all claim to the Netherlands, cannot be denominated "a question of small importance in itself." Had not the futility of this audacious assertion been self-evident, it had been flatly denied by more recent facts. It must be remembered, that the invasion of this absolute right by the Emperor Joseph the II. in the year 1784, had nearly involved Holland in hostilities with that Monarch. Antwerp belonged, at that time, to the Emperor, who wished to restore it to its former opulence and dignity; which could not, however, be effected without wresting from the Hollanders the exclusive navigation of this river. As Amsterdam rose upon the ruins of Antwerp, the re-instatement of Antwerp in its former glory must inevitably have crushed the flourishing state of Amsterdam. The opening of the Scheldt, however, was to be looked upon, not only in a commercial, but in a political point of view, as it would directly open the gate of a broad road into the very heart of the Dutch territories, and by that means probably cause the destruction of the Dutch as a nation. These  
 confi-



derations consequently obliged the Hollanders to be scrupulously tender of their exclusive rights over this river, as the guardian of their prosperity, and, indeed, the palladium of their existence. An event, therefore, so pregnant with inevitable ruin naturally roused the fears of the Dutch.

So unwarrantable, indeed, was the conduct of the Emperor, and so intuitively just and sacred were the claims of Holland, that, when she threw herself for protection into the arms of France, the latter, too well-acquainted with her own interest, and with that of all Europe, to suffer the former to become the prey of lawless rapacity, nobly covered with her shield the oppressed republic, and by her remonstrances with the Emperor (to whom she was, indeed, allied by the closest ties of consanguinity) not only averted a conflict in which Holland would probably have received her death-blow, but obtained for her an unequivocal recognition of the absolute and independent sovereignty over the Western Scheldt, conformably to the treaty of Munster.\* This wise and friendly conduct on

\* This treaty has been not only recognized, but confirmed and guaranteed by many subsequent conventions.



the part of France was the basis of an immediate treaty of alliance between that power and Holland, in which the most solemn obligations were reciprocally entered upon to *protect* each other from all hostile attacks. Though France chose to adopt a scheme of policy so diametrically opposite to her former line of conduct, it did not seem absolutely necessary that we should imitate her in the insolent violation of sacred conventions. Let us make, however, for the sake of argument, one momentary concession to falsehood. Let us grant, that the violation of the Scheldt "was a question of little importance in itself," to what does their assertion tend, but "to prove more clearly" (as was sagaciously observed by Lord Grenville) "that it was brought forward only for the purpose of *insulting* the allies of England by the *infraction* of their neutrality and by the *violation* of their rights, which the faith of treaties obliged us to maintain." This declaration on their part was most ill-judged. Since, if we admit their premises, the inference is irresistible. Points, frankly owned by their defenders to be nugatory and futile, if obstinately maintained in the serious hour of momentous contention, can be brought forward

forward solely in the malicious hope of making the breach too immense for reparation. It is, indeed, difficult to reconcile the *exclusive* power of France to annul this important treaty, without the *general* power of setting aside all the other treaties which mutually join all the Powers of Europe. Were we to be mocked by the whimsical assertion, that "if the rights of nature and of nations were to be consulted, not France alone, but all the nations of Europe are authorized to do it."\* If this shallow and preposterous doctrine of the "rights of nature" were but once admitted, who would have the presumption to prescribe its limits? We could not be secure from the apprehension, that, in their furious zeal for this new-fangled dogma, they would insist upon the uncontrollable right of proceeding up the Thames, without being subject to the payment of duties, which, I will not deny, are not demanded by the voice of nature. This defence was most flimsy and absurd. I am totally unable to discover how the "rights of nations" would authorize them to infringe upon the *exclusive* right of the Hollanders to the navigation

\* See Paper from M. Chauvelin to Lord Grenville, dated 13th January, 1793.

of the Scheldt. The law of nations was framed for the salutary purpose of preventing more powerful or ferocious nations, from trampling upon the privileges and violating the rights of the weaker or more mild. It must be observed, likewise, that no two ideas can be more dissimilar than the rights of *nature* and the rights of *nations*:—a nation, guided by the former, acknowledging the restraint of no law, exercises, with unbridled phrenzy, her own capricious will; whereas, if she obeys the precepts of the latter, she is obliged to keep her will, however violent, within the bounds prescribed by the customs and usages of civilized nations; these impulses, so dissimilar in their nature, and so different in their effects, cannot be contemporary and co-operative; since a nation who obeys the dictates of the one, must necessarily despise the mandates of the other.

It was not, indeed, wonderful that France, who seems to have regulated all her actions by the wild impulse of savage nature, should have been determined not to neglect it in this case, but it must truly create the greatest astonishment, that she could have the effrontery to defend



send her direct violation of the most solemn of all codes—the law of nations, by the false assertion that she was acting conformably to the rights of nature and of *nations* ;\* and that she should betray such gross ignorance as to declare, that those repugnant and idiosyncratic principles could possibly coalesce, and become the joint-directors of the national conduct. Were these false and flimsy assertions to be swallowed in the very nursery of national jurisprudence, the country of Grotius—the cradle of the law of nations? What indignation must it have roused in every enlightened mind to see them thus trample with ignorant and savage triumph upon this virtuous and venerable code, and fix in its place their barbarous and senseless jargon! We were not, surely, to be frightened into an acquiescence with these most absurd reasons “ fit only for fools “ aspiring to be knaves,” by the daring and insulting menace, that, if “ her explanations ap-

\* Their religious respect for this august code of laws has been clearly proved in a subsequent correspondence between the American Government and the French Envoy, M. Genet; being told that his proceedings were contrary to the spirit of Grotius and Vattel, he *modestly* replied, that he knew nothing about Grotius or Vattel, but that his conduct was agreeable to the *doctrines* of the French Constitution.



“peared insufficient, they would prepare for  
“war.”

After so unjust a violation of the most solemn treaties,—a violation so unwarrantable in its nature, and rendered peculiarly so from the recollection of the perfect neutrality of Holland, what reliance could be placed in the idle and hypocritic *assurance* of France, “that she would  
“not attack Holland, as long as that power  
“should, on its side, confine itself towards her  
“within the bounds of an exact neutrality,” when, at that very æra, she *had* infringed upon the rights and *had* violated the neutrality of that Republic by the forced passage up the Scheldt, in defiance of the alleged determination of the Government not to grant it, and notwithstanding the formal protest by which it was opposed?

Had Holland been so lost to every sense of duty as to have indulged France in her unjust wishes, she would undeniably have been instrumental in the injury which Austria might receive by the attack. And for what particular reason should she have been induced to injure Austria merely to gratify the caprice of France?

She

She was commanded then by prudence to remain neuter. Did she not observe, in the strictest manner, that neutrality? And was she to suffer herself to be seriously injured, and audaciously insulted, with passive impunity? Was it compatible too with our duty to behold with indifference these unprovoked indignities committed upon a faithful and peaceable ally, who had striven with us to preserve a most exact neutrality? Would it not have been a direct imitation of France, in the infraction of the most solemn treaties, to have denied our assistance at a moment when our ally was trampled on by a formidable foe? It has, indeed, been said, that our conduct was censurable in offering our assistance, as it had not been officially demanded: but as this accusation can have proceeded solely from a spirit of the most puny captiousness, I shall content myself with remarking, that had it been useless or officious, it would naturally have been complained of by Holland, as a vicious interference with her affairs. The gentlemen who are so prodigal in their censures of this step, do not seem willing to recollect, that a similar line of conduct was adopted by the Governor of the Netherlands when Holland was threatened with

E 4

subjugation

subjugation by Louis XIV.—The Count de Montery did not neglect the only opportunity which a favorable moment presented to him of affording essential service to the injured Hollanders, by confining himself (as in *common* cases where a superstitious reverence for mechanical rules may be harmlessly indulged) to the heavy tedious road of applying for, and receiving, regular instruction from his Court, but wisely building his conduct upon the solid basis of sound policy (though by no means demanded and fortified, as in our case, by the powerful obligation of an *existing convention*) saved Holland from destruction, and received the sanction of his Court, and the applause of all unprejudiced and enlightened Statesmen. We would ask, whether, when we saw our ally gasping for succour, we should have niggardly imprisoned it, till it had been implored through the prolix routine of office ceremonial, and thus indirectly aid the cause of her enemy? This was not a season to indulge in the inept parade of frigid and fastidious formalities. We should never forget the valuable apothegm of the learned Ambrosius—"Qui non repellit injuriam a socio, si potest, tam est in vitio, quam ille qui facit." Could



Could a man deny the assistance which it was in his power to give to a drowning friend, because the distressed object of his compassion had not loudly called for it?—It is, indeed, in cases of imminent danger that true friendship is unequivocally displayed.—*Certus amicus* (says the old Poet) in re incertâ cernitur. It has ever been esteemed, by the most profound Philosophers, to be the nature of *real* friendship, not penuriously to screw up her offices till they had been formally demanded, but generously to lavish them, the instant she *sees* them necessary to the salvation of the sufferer.—*Hæc igitur prima lex amicitiae sancitur, ut ab amicis honesta petimus, amicorum causâ honesta faciamus: ne expectemus quidem, dum rogemur: studium semper adsit, cunctatio absit.\** It was a most pressing moment, and our conduct on that occasion, so far from being censurable, was highly meritorious, and † *gratefully* felt by the Government of Holland.

After

\* *Cic. de Amicit.*

† For a declaration which so flatly belies the assertions of the opposers of the war, the highest evidence will naturally be expected. I appeal, therefore, to “the Reply of their High Mightinesses the States-General to the Memorial



After so lawless an aggression upon the rights of Holland, had we not the greatest reason to apprehend a similar attack upon ourselves? And yet, were we forbid at our peril to make any preparations

rial of Lord Auckland, his Britannic Majesty's Ambassador." This reply was dated the 20th March, 1793, six weeks after the declaration of war by France; a sufficient time surely after the violation of their territories, and the reception of successful support from this country, to enable them maturely to reflect upon their situation and our conduct.

" Their High Mightinesses have already had an opportunity of testifying, some time since, to Lord Auckland, how sensible they were of the repeated and *essential* proofs of the *affection* of his Britannic Majesty for this State—they now *renew* their assurances with no less sincerity; and the *immediate circumstances add to their satisfaction.*"

Again, " The union of the *succours* of British troops and vessels with the forces of the State, has *prevented* the enemy from penetrating further into the province of Holland.

" Their High Mightinesses will *constantly preserve* the most agreeable remembrance of the earnestness and promptitude with which his Royal Highness the Duke of York, invested with the command in chief of the British *auxiliary* troops, has been so very desirous of hastening to the *succour* of the Republic at this critical juncture. They will no more forget all they owe to the *services* and *good offices* rendered so *successfully* by the BRITISH AMBASSADOR to the advancement of the *common and inseparable interests* of the two States so strictly united."

Again, " Their High Mightinesses find themselves obliged to demand *with earnestness*, that the *succour* of the British troops and

preparations for defence. Although we knew that a considerable \*armament was getting ready in the ports of our enemy, we were assured that "if hostile preparations were continued in the "ports of England," they would punish us with war. This injurious insult was † a justifiable

and vessels which have already *reached* the Republic, as well as that which is immediately *expected*, may *not* be *withdrawn* before the complete evacuation of the frontiers of the state; and that in *every* case this *succour*, united to the forces of the Republic, may serve to pursue the *common* enemy, and to act ulteriorly against them.

"Their High Mightinesses seize on this occasion to give to his Britannic Majesty, and to the other *amicable* powers and *allies* of the state, the most solemn assurance, that they will employ all their means, to combat an enemy, they regard, not only as the *enemy* of the Republic, but also as the *enemy* of the *human* race, seeing that they have formed the project of *destroying* the happiness of civil society, by the annihilation of all the principles of religion, *justice*, and good order."

These declarations are, one would think, sufficiently unequivocal; and yet there are men, whose audacity drives them to the truly ridiculous length of fancying themselves better judges of the situation of Holland, than were the Dutch themselves. It were well if men would fortify their malicious assertions by some proof.

\* Brissot candidly confessed, in his appeal to his constituents (page 47) "that England did not begin to arm till three months after France."

† The justice which would have clothed the resentment of this injury, no man, I believe, will venture to deny. It is,

able reason for our commencing hostilities, had we been anxious for war; our conduct would have been defended by Cicero himself, who expressly declares—" *Qui non defendit, nec obstitit si potest Injuriae, tam est in vitio, quam si Parentes, aut Patriam aut Socios deserat.*" And indeed it must be confessed, that we subjected ourselves to the marked censure of the Roman Statesman by our omission to resent the insult by arms. Our predilection for peace, however, confined us to the mere assistance, which, in conformity to the most sacred treaties, we were bound to afford to an ally, in her defence against the most wanton and unprovoked aggressions. Thus false then is the assertion of Mr. Erskine, that "*we involved Holland in the horrors of war.*"\* So palpably atrocious, indeed, was the conduct of France, and so incontestable is the

is, indeed, the opinion of the most consummate jurisconsults, that expected attacks, unequivocally evinced by insulting menaces and by hostile preparations, may be justly prevented by *anticipation*. "*Fateor quidem*" says Grotius, "*si insultator arma arripiat, et quidem ita ut appareat eum id facere occidendi animo, OCCUPARI posse facinus.*"—*De Jure Bel. ac Pac. L. 2. c. 1. § 5.* A partiality for peace restrained England from availing herself of this right.

\* Page 35.



guilt attendant upon wanton aggression, that I am totally unable to discern upon what an assertion, so flatly belied by notorious facts, can possibly be grounded, unless he means to aver, that the assurance of *A* that he will fulfil his just and lawful engagements towards *B*, in case of an unprovoked and sanguinary attack from *C*, is such an unwarrantable insult to *C*, as fully to justify *C* in a violent assault of *B*:—a mode of reasoning I consider as too contemptibly sophistical to merit a reply. \* National faith has hitherto invariably been esteemed the bulwark and guardian of national friendship. The assurance, therefore, of a firm determination to preserve inviolately sacred treaties, never surely can load a country with obloquy, or merit condemnation. It is thus evident, then, that the assertions of Mr. Erskine are doubly refuted by the testimony of unalterable facts; and by the absurdity of the conclusions to which his arguments lead. And it must be confessed that there is no more justice in accusing Great Britain of plunging Holland into hostilities with France, than there

\* *Firmamentum* autem stabilitatis; constantiæque ejus quam in amicitia quærimus, FIDES est.—Cic. de Amicit.

would



would be in proclaiming her accountable for the wars of Pharamond or Clovis.

But I find that the rapacious conduct of France in her cruel aggression upon Holland, is indirectly justified by Mr. Erskine ; he tells us “ until the treaty of Pilnitz had been framed “ for the destruction of her constitution, and the “ dismemberment of the empire, she had not “ extended its limits.” Admitting, for the sake of argument, the whole of this assertion, does it justify France in her open attack upon Holland, who had not the most distant connection with the members of that treaty ?—Or does it excuse her for her insidious act of hostility against Great Britain, who equally abstained from all interference with it ? Should the sins of Germany be visited upon the children of Great Britain and Holland ? Mr. Erskine should have recollected, that unless the premises of an hypothesis are indisputable and solid, the conclusions to be drawn from them must be spurious and absurd. He should have considered, that unless he could prove that *these two powers* had any direct or indirect sway in that treaty, the grounds upon which

which he fixes his defence of France must be weak and untenable. It must not, however, be forgot, that I have granted merely pro tempore, the existence of this treaty; I find, however, that Mr. Erskine's argument deserves no advantage from this indulgence. I must, indeed, confess that it is totally foreign to our subject, but as it is a topic of much political scepticism, I may, I hope, be permitted to declare my real sentiments respecting it, which are, that my doubts of its existence amount to disbelief. I frankly own, that I have heard a great deal *said* of this famous treaty of Pilnitz;\* I must as frankly avow, that I have

\* I have often been astonished at the triumphant manner in which the existence of this treaty has been proclaimed by the advocates of France, as a proof of that league and dismemberment which reduced her to the necessity of universal war. This astonishment is not a little increased from the reflexion, that, at no time has it been alleged by France herself. That her defenders should strenuously endeavour to throw a veil over her indefensible aggressions is not, certainly, a subject of surprize, but that they should rest their cause upon a basis inconsistent in its nature, and totally unsupported by proof, was not within the range of the widest expectation. The most egregious inconsistency, however, betrays itself not unfrequently among the supporters of a system. This partition treaty is affirmed by one class of her advocates to have been concluded in July 1791,

I have never yet seen the man who could vouch for its genuineness, much less who had the audacity to insinuate that Great Britain and Holland were concerned in giving it birth, and I am inclined

1791, at Pavia; \* whilst by another it is asserted to have been concluded in August 1791, at Pilnitz. This is a contradiction which even jacobin sophistry has not dared either to defend or to explain. To suppose that the *same* treaty (of dismemberment) would be signed in two different countries, and in two sequent months, would be an absurdity disgraceful to common sense. The treaty of Pavia is said to have been concluded and signed by the Emperor "Leopold" on the part of "Austria." (This blunder is most egregious, as the signature of a *Sovereign* is never interchanged with those of the *ministers* of the Princes with whom he is treating)—by "Prince Nassau" on the part of "Russia" (it must be observed, that this is not the name of the personage it is intended to represent; that the Prince of Nassau is a Frenchman, a foreigner in Russia, and consequently incapable of signing any treaty in the name of the Empress, or of filling any *diplomatic* situation under her government, without a breach of a rule of policy adopted at her accession, and invariably observed during the whole of her reign; it is not unworthy of notice too, that this Prince was not in Italy during the year 1791; and that he was in that very month (July) cruising in the Baltic with the Russian flotilla) by "Count Florida Blanca" on the part "of Spain." (at this time Prime Minister, and owing to the duties of his office utterly unable to quit the kingdom)—and by "Bischopswerder" on the part of "Prussia" (the *only one* of these pretended Plenipotentiaries

\* Vide Debretil's *State Papers*, page 1.



clined to believe, that, had it been within the range of possibility, there are not wanting amongst us men, who would, were it merely to support their naked assertions, gladly have seized the

who was in *Italy* in 1791, but who was not *then* at *Pavia*, and who undoubtedly signed no treaties there, or elsewhere, with any Russian or Spanish ministers.) The inconsistencies with which this treaty is loaded, are, indeed, too glaring to merit notice. I should have passed them by in silent contempt, had I not known with what exultation it is frequently proclaimed as a justification of the conduct of France. It may not, however, be useless to remark, that these inconsistencies, gross as they are, dwindle into insignificance when compared to the stupendous absurdities contained in the pretended articles. But as I have shewn the rottenness of the fabric, it little matters what reptiles it contains. I cannot, however, omit to notice the indecent effrontery of the Editor of these papers, in daring to assert, that this treaty was acceded to by Great Britain and Holland, in \* *March*, 1792, when it may be recollected that the King of France sent Mr. Chauvelin in † *May*, 1792, charged with a letter thanking the King of Great Britain “ for the public marks of *affection* “ he had given him, and for his strict adherence to *neutrality*.” This assertion on the part of the Editor being self-destructive is perfectly innocuous to the British cause. Nor should I have exposed it, but in the hope of preventing his more incautious readers from swallowing so poisonous a bait. Having then shewn the absurdities which adhere to this spurious treaty, let us now advert to that of *Pilnitz*, which seems indeed to be rather predominant in the public

\* Vide Debrett's State Papers, page 1.

† Vide ditto, page 283.



the opportunity of describing its several features, and of proving beyond the power of refutation, that Great Britain and her ally were either its real parents, or that they were sedulously instru-

mental

mind, not that the former has ever been disclaimed, though its praises have, perhaps, of late been less frequently chanted. The cause of this prevalency is obvious. Conscious of the absurdity of the former treaty, they had recourse to a most dexterous but petty artifice,—to decline all enumeration of the new-fangled plan, for the destruction (as they affirm) of the constitution, and for the division of the territory, of France; and consequently to elude the grasp of criticism. This is a trick at once contemptible and useless; since, as they have injudiciously omitted, it is more than a presumptive proof that they are unable to declare its component parts. What but inability would prevent them from producing the proof of that treaty, upon which they rest the virtue of their cause, whose validity is by some denied; and of whose secrets \* Great Britain has solemnly declared her total ignorance? Would not France herself, if she were capable, particularize with rapturous avidity that treaty, which is affirmed to have been for the plunder of her dominions, and upon whose condemnation the justice of her cause necessarily depends? And is not the omission of so beneficial a proof a strong cause to suppose it never existed? To be brief. This treaty is the same with that of Pavia, or it is not.—If it be, it has already received

\* See Lord Grenville's Note to Lord Malmesbury, dated 20th July, 1797, and published among the papers of the negotiation at Lisle.

mental in obstetrically bringing it into life. It was, indeed, to be expected, that Mr. Erskine would produce the proof of that charge, of which he has, hitherto, made but the assertion; since upon an affair of such awful moment, general conviction is not to be grounded upon vulgar report. To prove a negative, is a task of so difficult a nature, that it will never be required by liberal men. I shall, therefore, not attempt it, but content myself with avowing, that as the strongest reasons induce me to doubt its existence, and as Mr. Erskine has not been able to afford me any proof of its validity—a proof so indispensably essential, that its absence shakes the whole fabric of his doctrine; candour obliges me to think its existence, and all the reports propagated respecting it, as

“ Little else but dreams,

“ Conjectures, fancies, built on nothing firm.”

a sufficient refutation. If it be not, it must be owned, that from the recollection of the falsehood of their former ideal treaty, and from their suspicious neglect to describe its several items, and to prove by whom it was signed and concluded, it amounts nearly to a demonstration, that it is merely a vicious fiction invented to cast unmerited obloquy upon the nations of Europe, and to afford some colour to France in her licentious aggressions upon neutral states.

But

But though I refuse to admit the existence of the treaty of dismemberment of Pilnitz, concluded as it is said, by *four* of the continental powers, I would not wish to deny, that a treaty was entered into by Austria and Prussia. This real treaty was, however, totally different in its nature and design from the pretended. As any mention of it is irrelevant to our subject, some apology may, perhaps, be requisite for the remarks necessary to shew, that had not an interference with the dispute between Austria and France been precluded by the sacred duties of neutrality, it would certainly have been prevented by a consciousness of its utility. These remarks are, however, in some degree rendered necessary by Mr. Erskine's censure of our declining all interference, "it was entreated" he says, "by France but haughtily refused," to which I shall merely reply, that he cannot affirm that it was demanded by Austria; which *alone* proves that it would have been offensively obtrusive, and consequently highly criminal.

This treaty was concluded a considerable time after the Royal Family of France had been insulted



sulted by the most indecent outrages\*; after the King's palace of Versailles had been forced, his guards butchered before his eyes, and himself and family imminently exposed to the danger of assassination by a lawless rabble; after he had been ignominiously prevented, by the dreadful violence of a hired mob, aided by the national guard, from spending the day at his palace at St. Cloud, and detained in lingering suspense for three hours in the Thuilleries, loaded with the most horrid imprecations and murderous threats.— After incessant tortures drove him to the excusable, though dangerous plan, of flying with his family from his savage persecutors; after he had been led back in demoniac triumph, and overwhelmed with heavier chains; after, in a word, he had been violently stripped of all his accustomed and merited prerogatives, and of those inseparable from sovereigns. After all those horrid crimes, the Emperor of Germany and King of Prussia formed the virtuous and chivalrous plan of uniting their forces, to crush the system of

\* These took place as early as 1789, and strengthened in enormity as they increased in number.

† April 1791.



anarchy which was desolating France, and which threatened their own and every country of Europe; and to compel a gang of rebels to liberate their captive *King*, and to restore him to that authority which every impulse of his benevolent mind so peculiarly deserved. To suppose that they were actuated by views of personal aggrandisement, is a sentiment at which candour would have spurned, even had it not been belied by notorious fact: since no sooner had the King accepted the Constitution, and appeared restored to a semblance of liberty, than the whole of the plan, (which had merely existed in idea) instantly evaporated. The wavering Leopold, notorious for his abhorrence of war, thought this a favorable opportunity to creep out of an alliance, into which he had entered not with a resolute and propitious spirit; and instantly proclaimed that \* “the perils were no longer pressing; as the late events gave hopes of better times.” This conduct, (though perhaps now to be lamented by France) necessarily rendered the views of Frederick totally ineffectual: it will not be denied,

\* Extract from the circular dispatch of the aulic and state Chancellor, Prince de Kaunitz, to his Imperial Majesty's Ministers at foreign Courts. Dated, Vienna, November 1, 1791.

however,

however, that it was an unequivocal, and incontestable proof of pacific intentions towards France. So invariably adverse to hostilities was the Cabinet of Vienna, that the Elector of Mayence (who was intimately acquainted with its views) confessed to the \*Marquis de Bouillé, when the French declared war against Austria, some time after the death of Leopold, "You are very happy that the French are the *ag-gressors*, otherwise you would have had no "war."

Their interference to settle the perilous dissensions of France, and to protect an injured Monarch, had it been carried into real effect, would have been completely justified by the principles of former policy, and of the law of nations. To shew that such conduct would not have been unprecedented, one example will suffice.—In the sixteenth century, the Spaniards sent assistance to the chiefs of the League, and to the incarcerated King, the Cardinal de Bour-

\* For an account of continental politics, at this important epoch, and particularly of the treaty of Pilnitz, I would presume to recommend the perusal of the Marquis de Bouillé's "Memoirs relating to the French Revolution."

bonum. It is, indeed, expressly laid down by Vattel, "that a King does not lose his quality 'merely by the loss of his kingdom' (or by the loss of power and prerogative, which are synonymous,) 'if he is *stripped of it unjustly* by an usurper, or by *rebels*, he *preserves his rights*, in the number of which are his alliances."

But to return to the subject under our more immediate consideration: "The vessel had long been full; one drop superadded, made the 'waters of bitterness overflow,'† which have ever since deluged the garden of Europe. These ferocious and sanguinary barbarians, not content with having torn from their ill-fated Sovereign, every legal prerogative and power, not satisfied with exposing the fallen and degraded majesty of Louis, to the scoffs and derisions of a grinning mob, thirsted like wild cannibals for the feast of human blood, and gorged themselves with the gore of their murdered Monarch. Was such a deed to be looked upon with supine apathy by surrounding nations?—Wounded humanity forbade it! Could this country, renowned for exquisite sensibility, and generous feelings,

\* Book 2d. Chap. 12th. † Bolingbroke.



be hardened to the atrocity of so heinous a crime? Could we, with safety, have connection any longer with that polluted fountain, whose infectious waters poisoned the love of every moral duty? Would it have been decorous in us to have continued in a state of amicable intercourse, and in an interchange of neighbourly offices, with a lawless banditti, who had committed greater enormities than ever before sullied the pages of history; and who could defy the annals of all time to produce any thing comparable to their bloody achievements? Would it not have been a tacit approval of such unheard of crimes, to have continued in the bonds of fellowship with revolutionary savages who had proclaimed war against all social order; who had thus trampled upon all laws human and divine; and whose principles, now carried into practice and crowned with success, were inseparably attended by their desolating satellites—Plunder, Rapine, and Massacre? Was it not imperiously demanded by prudence that we should avoid all communion with that Trophonian cave? At that awful moment when giant rebellion had quitted his den, and with gigantic stride was stalking over France, nothing but the high



high mounds of rigid neutrality and complete separation, could have prevented us from falling an easy prey to the wild and blood-thirsty monster. When Great Britain saw France agonized by intestine convulsions, and writhing with the torture of complicated disorders, she watched in silence the approaching crisis :—It came.—Self-preservation warned her to shun the deadly spring which caused her neighbour's dissolution.

Could we, with safety, be upon terms of cordiality with a people, who had grossly violated a constitution which they had so recently vaunted to be the model of perfection, and which they had solemnly sworn to maintain with the most religious exactness? Could we count upon a day's existence in union with a gang of desperadoes, who had hurled religion from her sacred throne, and had assisted their grim "Moloch "Homicide" in usurping it? Could we commune with this new set of cannibal-philosophers, whose principal tenets were that \* Insurrection should be consecrated as the most sacred duty.

\* The principle proposed by La Fayette, and adopted by the National Assembly.

That

• That solemn and public festivals should be celebrated in honour of the basest criminals—that the mere possession of property was hostile to the public good—that opulence merited the most ignominious death—and that private wealth should be confiscated for the benefit of these systematic anarchists.—A sect which had wallowed in atrocities, which defy the power of language to describe, and at which, in the words of Shakspeare, “The face of heaven glowed with horror?” Would it have been decorous in this country to have remained in the bonds of fellowship with a savage horde, who, not content with desolating their own country, pushed their excesses even to the length of violating the rights and invading the territories of their peaceful neighbour, and our faithful ally? These heinous crimes, caused in this country, such sensations of horror and disgust, that his Majesty felt himself obliged to declare, “that their ambassador could no longer be permitted to reside here.”

But though the outrageous conduct of France had constrained his Majesty to adopt this ne-

\* To the soldiers set at liberty from the galleys, and the assassins of Avignon, Nismes, and Arles.

cessary,

cessary, though disagreeable, measure, it was by no means censurable by France, nor could it be construed, twist and torture it as you please, into a proof of hostilities. So far from being capricious, it was indispensably necessary, and so far from being hostile, it was undeniably pacific: "It is natural, indeed," says Vattel, "and very agreeable to the sentiments which nations owe to each other, that those resident Ministers *when there is nothing to fear from their stay*, should be friendly received: *but if there be any solid reasons against this, what is for the good of the state ought unquestionably to be preferred*; and the foreign Sovereign *cannot take it amiss*, if the Minister who has concluded the affair of his commission," (the precise case of M. Chauvelin, as his powers were no longer valid, owing to the murder of his Sovereign by whom they were granted), "and has no other affairs to negotiate, be desired to depart." He adds likewise, that "republics have often very good reasons, such as relate to the constitution of a government, and the state of a nation, to excuse themselves from continually suffering foreign Ministers who corrupt the citizens, in order to

\* The decree of the 19th November was entirely of this nature, and, though not the production of a Minister, was infinitely



"get them over to their masters, to the great prejudice of the republic, and fomenting of parties."  
 "These" he affirms "would be more than sufficient for wise and provident rulers to dismiss them."

To the assertion of Mr. Erskine, that the dismissal of M. Chauvelin was a direct interference with the internal affairs of France, let us oppose, then, the authority of this eminent jurist. Whether the opinion of the latter, fortified by solid argument, and by the testimony of common sense, be preferable to that of the former, totally unsupported by either, does not become me to determine. But without using this argumentum ad verecundiam, it is sufficient for our purpose to know (candour, indeed, commands us to acknowledge) that although the dismissal of their Ambassador will be found to be one of the futile reasons assigned as a justification of their declaration of war, still even *they* were not willing to risk so absurd an assertion. They affected to

infinitely more dangerous, being the express will of a Government. The conduct of M. Chauvelin too, it must be confessed, was not exempt from insidious machinations. He cannot be denied the merit of having been the zealous advocate for democratic anarchy.

esteem  
 of the 13th November was entirely of this  
 nature, and, though not the production of a Minister, was  
 infinitely



esteem it as an insult, but did not forget themselves so far as to hint that it was an interference with the internal affairs of their country. They would gladly have intrenched themselves upon this ground, had they not known it to be indefensible. This argument admits of a familiar analogy. If I should find the visits of a man dangerous, and should be driven to the disagreeable necessity of shewing him the door, and of refusing him the offices of hospitality, it does not necessarily follow, surely, that I must have a strong desire of entering into his house.—Such a conclusion would not be very creditable to the sanity of his intellect.

To have remained in cordial amity with France was impracticable. To have blown the trumpet of war, though unquestionably justifiable, was not congenial to the mild and pacific disposition of Great Britain.—There was no ground, then, tenable, but armed neutrality.

But we are informed by Mr. Erskine, that “before this period (the dismissal of M. Chauv-  
“lin) France was undoubtedly solicitous for  
“peace; that she had done none of the acts  
“complained

“complained of in the correspondence, until  
 “her independence had been threatened by a  
 “hostile confederacy.” She gave an unequivocal proof, it must be confessed, of her ardent desire for peace, by hostilely sowing the seeds of her revolutionary principles, and by the most flagrant attempts to excite rebellion in Great Britain, who cannot be accused of having entered, in the most distant manner, into the confederacy against her.—“She had prayed the  
 “mediation of Great Britain to dissolve that  
 “confederacy, and to avert its consequences.” And thus by alluring her into disputes with which she had no concern, to make her abandon those principles of neutrality which she had so solemnly vowed to maintain, and upon which France herself could not refrain from bestowing a merited eulogy. “She had disavowed conquests and aggrandisements, and the *only steps*  
 “she had taken inconsistent with that declaration, were invasion of the territories of Princes  
 “confederated, or confederating, against her.” She proved the truth of this disavowal by the invasion of the \* Comptat Venaissin and of  
 Avignon,

\* The Comptat Venaissin belonged to the Counts of Thoulouse, when Raymond VII. ceded it to the Papal Chair,

Avignon,\* the lawful and indisputable possessions of the Pope, and by suppressing the rights, and invading the possessions of the German Princes in Alsace and Lorraine. And "another step  
Chair, in 1228, by the treaty of Paris, which re-united Languedoc to the Crown of France.

\* The city of Avignon belonged to the Counts of Thoulouse and Provence. In process of time it fell into the exclusive possession of the house of Provence. The entire sovereignty of this city, and of its territory, was sold in 1248, to Pope Clement VI. by Joan, Queen of Naples and Comptesse of Provence. This alienation, it must be observed, was not the price of indulgencies, nor of absolution from sins; it proceeded neither from seduction, nor from force, but was a voluntary treaty, executed in the presence, and with the consent, of her husband Louis de Tarente; it was, besides, ratified by the sanction of their *Suzerain*, the Emperor Charles the Fourth. The legality of this act, therefore, was beyond dispute, and the lawful possession of it by the Pope could be denied only by that authority which recognizes no other law than superiority of arms. The profound Abbé Maury, after having traced, with his usual historical precision, this affair to its source; after having shewn its validity, and proved, beyond the power of refutation, the ownership of this city by the See of Rome, makes these observations upon the flimsy attempts of anarchic publicists to quibble away this solemn right, and to deny the validity of this ancient contract: "L'Esprit de chicane a épuisé, dès long-tems, ses plus subtiles combinaisons, pour découvrir de nullités, dans ce contrat. Toutes les *Arguties*, que M. Bouche s'approprie modestement comme des découvertes de son génie, ont été confondues avec tant d'évidence,



"she had taken *rather* inconsistent with this declaration" was a violation of the rights and territory of Holland—a country which Mr. Erskine will not venture to affirm either to "be confederating, or to have confederated, against her." "She offered to respect the neutrality of Holland;" and realized this promise by an infringement upon her treaties, and by an usurpation of her just and acknowledged privileges; and solemnly disavowed every act or intention "to disturb the Government of Great Britain." The steps she had taken, inconsistent with these solemn vows, were by sending forth her inflammatory decree of the 19th November, to kindle insurrection, and by smuggling into this country her republican emissaries for the hostile purpose of raising rebellion.

But the usurping faction of France, not satisfied with their insolent and unprovoked aggression,

*présidence, qu'aucun critique du troisième ordre ne se permettoit, plus de les répéter aujourd'hui.*—"Toutes les difficultés que l'on a voulu élever, contre la validité de ce contrat, n'ont servi qu'à mieux en démontrer la légitimité."

The invincible argument of *quia sum leo*, advanced by the despotic usurpers of France, was not, however, to be overcome even by the powerful logic of the learned Abbé.

sions upon Holland, resolved, in their insatiate thirst for domination and universal rapine, to issue a decree which should strike Europe with the most indignant astonishment :—a decree of a nature so extravagant and preposterous, that the records of history cannot boast of any example even of the most distant similitude. It may certainly claim the merit of barbarous originality.

The heterogeneous crew who stiled themselves the National Convention, and who had insolently grasped the executive power of France, passed, on the 1st February 1793, a decree which declared war against the King of Great Britain, and the Stadtholder of the United Provinces.

How truly contemptible must it appear to every enlightened and reflecting mind when it learns, that the reasons which these miscreants assigned as the cause of this act, and for the justification of their sanguinary resolution to “cry havock and let slip the dogs of war,” were, principally because we had ordered our Ambassador to withdraw himself from France—We had passed an act for the establishment of regu-

lations

lations respecting aliens—we had thought proper to encrease our land and sea forces—we had, on hearing of the murder of Louis XVI. ordered M. Chauvelin \* to quit the territory of Great Britain.

\* It is not, perhaps, irrelevant to remark, that *long before the appearance* of hostility, France had determined upon war with this country, and although the dismissal of M. Chauvelin was the *plausible pretext* for the commencement of hostilities, it is *now* well known, that America had been pressed to enter into a coalition with France *long before that dismissal*. To prove this, I beg leave to make an extract from a pamphlet, written by Mr. Harper;—an American, a Member of Congress, and a man whose well known attachment to the interests of America, and good wishes towards France (before her late indecent and outrageous conduct towards America) will secure him from the imputation of being a venal supporter of the British Government.

“ It is perfectly well known that ~~the~~ (France) long since  
 “ formed, and still pursues with the most steady perseverance  
 “ a system of aggrandizement in Europe; for insuring the  
 “ success of which, it is absolutely essential that the mari-  
 “ time power of England should be reduced. Germany  
 “ opposed barriers to her by land, which were also to be re-  
 “ moved. Accordingly Germany was to be divided, and a  
 “ maritime coalition formed against England. Of this co-  
 “ alition the *United States were to form an important part*; for  
 “ though we had no navy, it was known that we had the  
 “ means of speedily forming one; and that when once en-  
 “ gaged in the war, we should be obliged to exert them.  
 “ The great number of our merchant ships, in the mean  
 “ time, the skill, numbers and enterprising character of our  
 “ seamen; the abundance of provisions and naval stores in



Britain. These were the prominent features (the others are, indeed, too puerile to merit notice) which characterised the Report of the Committee of General Defence, upon which the declaration of war was founded.

The accusations against the Stadtholder of the United Provinces, were, if possible, still more ludicrous. He had treated with contempt

“ our country ; the convenience of our harbours ; and,  
 “ above all, our vicinity to the West Indies, where the  
 “ commerce and navy of England are most susceptible of a  
 “ deep and deadly wound, would have rendered us a most  
 “ important ally in a maritime war against that power.  
 “ To cut off our commerce with her at the same time, the  
 “ importance whereof to her, though certainly great, has  
 “ been far over-rated by France, would greatly aid the blow.  
 “ Accordingly we find, that as soon as the Republic and  
 “ the power of the Jacobin Leaders were established, and  
 “ before the war with England commenced, M. Genet was sent  
 “ out with express instructions to bring about this alliance ; and  
 “ I have been assured by a gentleman who, about that time,  
 “ acted a considerable part in the Convention, but has since  
 “ visited America, that this maritime coalition was early  
 “ devised, and that “ nothing was wanting to its comple-  
 “ tion, but the consent of the United States.” “ That  
 “ consent,” he added, with an air of resentment which  
 “ four years have not been able to allay, “ WAS APPLIED  
 “ FOR AND WAS REFUSED.”

*Harper's Observations on the Disputes between  
 the United States and France, page 85.*

the

the agents of France—he had welcomed the emigrants—and, to crown the whole, he had commanded an armament by sea, appointed an Admiral, and ordered the Dutch vessels to join the English squadron.

Had any thing been wanting to exhibit to astonished Europe, in the most clear and undisguised manner, the bloody determination of this “ Stygian Council,” to riot in universal war and desolation, it had been amply furnished by this memorable decree. War, it seems, is declared against Great Britain, because she had taken the necessary precautions to prevent herself from being overrun by swarms of rebellious marauders, who visited her for no other purpose than to act the same tragical part they had performed, and were still performing, in all the pride and pomp of success, in their own country :—precautions which, as I have before observed, were provided by the simple registry of name and place of destination, which was an irreproachable and indispensable measure of national police, and to which we are indebted for our present domestic tranquillity. Because she found it absolutely necessary, after having witnessed the lawless ravages of France

G 3

upon

upon her ally Holland, to strengthen and augment her forces by land and sea, for self-preservation against foreign attack. And because she had, after having viewed in fearful silence innumerable acts of the most heinous atrocity committed by France against her own peaceable inhabitants, after having beheld her, in her wild freaks of oppression and rapine, trample upon the lawful rights of neutral nations, and, in a word, conduct herself in a manner absolutely destructive to civilized society, wisely determined to hold no further connexion with the poisonous fountain of regicide:—a determination which could be fulfilled only by the recal of our own Ambassador and the dismissal of theirs.

Against the Stadtholder, we find it decreed, because he had (as they allege) welcomed the persecuted emigrants; (men who for their loyalty and love of order, were ignominiously hunted from their native country, and who were not, in fact, owing to apprehensions of jealousy on the part of the French usurpers, treated with that compassion and tenderness which their miseries implored;—men for the alleviation of whose distress every feeling heart so eloquently pleaded!)



pleaded!) because he had vexatiously treated the French patriots; (so far from this being true, they were treated with too much lenity considering the danger of the principles they industriously and sedulously diffeminated;) because he had set at liberty some fabricators of false assignats; (this declaration is also false; for as soon as the accusations appeared to *impartial* and *upright* judges to be well-founded, the delinquent was punished in the most exemplary manner.) Because he had armed ships to act conjunctly with Great Britain; opened a loan, and created obstacles to the French trade. (The only charges which are founded in truth; but the crime will not, I believe, be judged by the reader to be inexpiably atrocious, when he is informed that the *violation of the Scheldt had then been committed.*)

When we found, then, that war was declared against us upon these groundless reasons;—when we beheld them glory in their wild and desolating conduct,—a conduct so accurately described by Grotius, that one would imagine he had been living to witness it;—he says, “Vide-  
bam per Christianum orbem vel barbaris gen-

“*tibus pudendam bellandi licentiam: levibus  
 “ aut nullis de causis ad arma procurri, quibus  
 “ semel sumptis nullam jam divini, nullam humani  
 “ juris reverentiam, plane quasi UNO EDICTO AD  
 “ OMNIA SCELERA EMISSO FURORE:\**”—when  
 we reflected that the continual injuries sustained  
 by this country from the despotic usurpers of  
 France, as well as the unprovoked aggressions  
 committed upon our faithful ally, *would have  
 been just cause for a declaration of hostilities on our  
 part:—*did not justice command us to take up  
 arms in our own defence——

——And tell *aggressing* France

How Britain's sons and Britain's friends can fight?

——When we saw the most solemn treaties ignominiously violated, and neutral countries lawlessly ravaged;—when we recollected the numerous attempts to introduce into this country their terrible principles of civil violence and irreligion;—when we beheld them assiduously endeavour to root loyalty and allegiance from the minds of Englishmen, and to plant in their place anarchy and rebellion;—when we found them animated with the hopes of tyrannizing

\* Prolegomena de Jure Bel. ac Pac.

over

over us with absolute sway, and of reducing Great Britain to the abject state of a Gallic province:—were we to fall prostrate on the earth and lick the feet of Regicides?—

———Soldier, I had arms—

Had wealth, dominion. *Dost thou wonder, Roman,  
That I fought to save them?*—What if Cæsar aims  
To lord it universal o'er the world, shall the world  
Tamely crouch at Cæsar's footstool?

“Are these sentiments,” to use the words of Lord Bolingbroke, “which any man, who is  
“born a Briton, in any circumstances, in any  
“situation, *ought to be ashamed or afraid to  
“avow?*”

“The motives,” says Dean Swift, “that may  
“engage a wise Prince or a state in war, I take  
“to be *one or more* of these: either to check the  
“dangerous power of some ambitious neigh-  
“bour; to recover what has been unjustly taken  
“from them; to revenge some injury they had  
“received; (which all political casuists allow) to  
“assist some *ally* in a just quarrel; or lastly to  
“defend themselves when they are invaded.”  
In all these cases the writers upon politics admit  
a war to be *justly* undertaken. How highly just,  
then,



then must that war be, which proceeded from *all* these causes collected and amalgamated into one colossæan mass : which according to Livy, *defendi, repetique et ulcisci fas est !* Though, perhaps, their advocates may captiously tell us, that the *last* was not realized with respect to us, yet it will not be denied, that it had been fulfilled towards our ally, which is undeniably the same, and that so boundless and rapacious were the designs of the enemy, that *we* had the greatest reason to apprehend an attempt. After such a chain of enormities, and injuries, no man will surely persist in the obstinate and ignorant determination to deny the \* justice and necessity of

\* If any collateral proof of this had been wanting, it might be found in one of the charges brought against Brissot, who was, it may be remembered, at the time of the rupture, one of the principal rulers of the Convention.—The awful charge exhibited against him was, that *he had been the author of the attack upon Holland and England.* A fact of this nature is worth a hundred arguments, and clearly demonstrates to the simplest understanding, that their aggressions were so palpable that even *they themselves* had not sufficient audacity to attempt the denial of them. It displays, besides, a flagrant contradiction to the bold, but unsupported, assertions of their British defenders.—It was reserved for them to advance fallacies, from which the most frontless hireling of a Roberespierre or a Brissot would instantly have shrunk. The Gallic usurper did not pretend to deny or refute the charge of

of the contest: they are founded upon a basis which all the arts of sophistry and prejudice are unable to demolish. Such blind perversity ought not, indeed, be combated as absurd, but pitied as insane. It must be confessed, in truth, that a man who is not an execrable enemy to his country, will admire the unexampled peacefulness of her disposition, which could confine the sword in its sheath, when it might justly have been wielded in punishment of insults to ourselves and injuries to our ally; and which would not permit it to defend her rights till all hopes of tranquillity were chased away by an unmerited and wanton declaration of war. Such a man will naturally reflect, that if France can be justified in the eyes of her English advocates, in her innumerable acts of unprovoked rancour against both these countries, whilst the *peaceable* dispo-

of aggression, but contented himself with endeavouring to prove, that it did not originate with *him*, but was solely to be ascribed to Roberfpierre.—This circumstance alone, forms an unanswerable reply to the flimsy declamations employed in disproof of the justice of the war.

It is confessed by Brissot, (in his Appeal to his Constituents, page 60), that at this time, “a determination had been made to brave all Europe.”

sition

fition of Great Britain is condemned as provoking hostility; language is insufficient either to characterize the gross and prejudiced inconsistency of *their* conduct, or to describe the justice, necessity, piety, and wisdom of that war which was absolutely forced upon Great Britain for her protection from the rude and sanguinary attacks of an implacable enemy. It ought not to be a question of controversy.—The self-evident testimony of incontrovertible facts proves, that it is to be ascribed solely to the unprovoked aggressions and injurious insults of tyrannical France.

But, says another class of the censurers of the war, with an affectation of triumph, (for upon this question the opposers themselves are materially divided), war is not just unless it is absolutely unavoidable; and a nation which seeks reparation for injury, or satisfaction for insult, by an appeal to arms, is culpable;—unless she has tried to adjust the pending dispute by amicable negotiation. We cheerfully admit the truth of this hypothesis; since, so far from tending to weaken (as it is intended), it greatly strengthens the justice of our cause.

In



In considering the justice of this serious charge, we must in the first place observe, that upon this subject a most strange inconsistency has betrayed itself. It was proudly affirmed by M. Le Brun, that Mr. Pitt *courted* a conference with M. Maret. It has been confidently asserted by the opposition of this country, that an interview was requested by this gentleman, who (as they allege) was invested with powers to negotiate, but was *refused* by the British Minister. These contradictory and repugnant declarations merit no other notice than to be declared unfounded. They are both equally and notoriously false. M. Maret was charged with no mission on the part of France. He came over to this country merely to settle some affairs of the Duc d'Orleans. An interview, however, certainly took place between him and Mr. Pitt, owing to a delusion which was practised upon both. When Mr. Pitt was informed that an agent from France was arrived, and wished to see him; in the hope that the French Ministry might have repented of their hostile conduct, and that he might be charged with a pacific mission, he readily assented to an interview. He soon found, however, that he was totally *unauthorized* by the Executive Council to  
commune

commune with him, or any other of his Majesty's Ministers. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was, in truth, on this occasion, most insolently deceived. It is but justice, however, to own, that both were the dupes of a third person. The confession of M. Maret should cover with shame (if men, who are in the habit of advancing unsupported assertions, could feel shame), the assertors of such false and malicious inconsistencies. Betrayed into an interview by the duplicity of a friend, he frankly avows "Je n'étois point agent secret. \*Je n'avois ni autorisation ni mission, et j'ai dit la vérité, en le déclarant à vous et à Mr. Pitt."—The British Minister, anxious to avoid a rupture with France, by all the means compatible with the honour and safety of his country, and conscious of the malignant disposition of M. Chauvelin, expressed, in this conference, his cheerfulness to treat with him (M. Maret) as a confidential person from the Executive Council. The latter, sincerely deprecating hostilities between the two countries, dispatched a courier to Paris, to request the necessary authority to treat confidentially with the British government. His virtuous designs were

\* Extract from a letter from M. Maret, to Mr. Miles.

baffled.

baffled. For M. Chauvelin (whose conduct had systematically evinced an ardent wish to render the breach between the two countries irreparable) inflamed with the most ferocious jealousy at the favour which this country shewed to the advocate for peace, implored the French Minister to blast his salutary endeavours. His prayers were unfortunately heard. M. Le Brun and his sanguinary colleagues, determined that their long-formed resolutions to plunge the two countries into the most acrimonious war, should not be frustrated by so philanthropic a desire, preferred the advice and conduct of M. Chauvelin, who had invariably acted agreeably to their wishes. They not only reprimanded M. Maret for his pacific attempt, but positively forbid him to enter into any explanations with the British Ministry, and ordered him instantly to \* return to Paris.

\* Had not I known the eagerness with which certain cavillers seize every thing which seems favourable to their cause, and torture it till it quadrates with their arguments; I should have deemed it totally unnecessary to observe, that soon after this recall, M. Maret, in the hope of effecting a conciliation, returned to this country, in some degree with the sanction of France. After having waited, however, a week in anxious and daily expectation of official instructions, his

second



Paris. He was commanded to announce that M. Chauvelin was the only one *authorized* by France to enter into discussions on national affairs. So numerous are the instances in which they aggravated injury by the most studied acts of insult, that it seems almost unnecessary to mention that the *very day* (1st February, 1793,) which had been appointed for a conference to be held between Lord Auckland (by the express desire of his Court, in the laudable determination to leave no step, consistent with the national honour, untried, for the attainment of conciliation), and General Dumourier, was carefully chosen for issuing their wanton declaration of war.

second and last attempt at pacification was rendered abortive, solely by the inveterate malignity of France, in studiously neglecting to give him those instructions for which he had pressing applied, and which were indispensably requisite to the success of his project. He consequently returned to his country without having obtained any intercourse with the British government. From these instances, our avidity to seize every honourable means of averting hostilities must be manifest. It must be thus evident, likewise, that had not the Executive Council been determined to avoid every possibility of amicable negotiation, it would have eagerly seized this favourable opportunity of entering upon it, by transmitting the necessary powers to a man known to *each* country as the friend to peace.

To

( To vindicate Great Britain from this allegation upon more notorious grounds.—It is known to all Europe, that we carried on the negotiation with M. Chauvelin, even after we found that the malignant spirit of France had induced her to proclaim her flagitious decree ; and, likewise, to make an unlawful aggression upon our peaceable ally ; (which, as I have before remarked, according to the high authority of Vattel, would have been just cause to dismiss him.) These are incontestable proofs of our not being anxious to enter into the war. It must not be forgot too, that, upon our remonstrating with the French Government, through their organ M. Chauvelin, upon the lawless rapacity of their conduct, we were insulted by an answer at once frivolous and menacing. We found that they persevered in their intentions of interfering with the affairs of other countries.—We found that their decree of the 19th November was still cherished by their most marked approbation and sanction :—After they discovered that its truly alarming tendency caused such a panic in the public mind of this country, the least they could have done was, to promise its repeal, (not that this could have allayed *our* fears, though it

H

would

would have been some extenuation of *their* guilt.) But even this was not offered. It would not only have defeated the great purpose which they steadfastly pursued—general insurrection in every state; but would have instantly poisoned those hopes, which they had long nourished, and which, at this very moment, they flattered themselves, were about to be crowned with success. The Convention was animated to pursue its sanguinary projects, by the illusory assurance, that the mine of revolt had been so skilfully dug in this country, that nothing was wanting but the application of the match by the hand of France, to hurl the laws and constitution of Britain into one dreadful chaos.\*—We found too, that they still persisted in their wanton aggressions upon Holland, notwithstanding its palpable injustice; and we were boldly assured, that France would continue in the occupation of the Low Countries during the continuance of the war, (but its

the happy issue of the negotiation. As the same  
 \* “ Le Peuple Anglois mécontent et opprimé n’attend que le signal pour se revolter. ” — Discours de M. le Brun, Ministre pour des Affaires Etrangères, à la Convention Nationale.

The part which this cruel usurper acted in producing the war, was one of the charges exhibited against him, and for which he very justly forfeited his life.

duration



duration what it might) and the time which might be necessary for the Belgians to insure and consolidate (what they impudently called) their liberty. Was this a satisfactory apology to Great Britain for the unprovoked aggression on her ally, to be audaciously told, that they would still continue to riot in aggression, and that they were determined to keep their usurped ground during the indefinite and undefinable space of the continuance of the war, and till they had succeeded in their diabolical attempt to incite the Belgians to rebel against their lawful Prince? When we found that they would not recede from their lawless usurpation, but on the contrary, wantonly threatened to maintain it by force of arms, **NEGOTIATION WAS AT AN END.** Nothing can betray a disposition to paltry and technical sophistry more forcibly than to argue, that our refusal to acknowledge M. Chauvelin minister from the French Republic, was unfavourable to the happy issue of the negotiation. As the same disposition on the part of France must have dictated the same line of conduct on the part of her Minister, he being merely the channel through which the expression of that disposition flowed, that conduct is not alterable by a mere change

of name.—Unless it can be demonstrated then, that, as *accredited* Minister from the French Republic, he would have advanced different claims from those he exhibited in his *unacknowledged* capacity, (which would be to confess, that in *one* of these cases he must have been an enemy to the *general* interests of France;) their argument is equally frivolous and absurd. It cannot be denied, that so far from refusing, we kept open the negotiation till it was actually dissolved by France herself.—By an audacious refusal to make any satisfaction for past injuries, and by her tyrannical declaration of an inflexible perseverance in them, she shut up the channel of negotiation. For since the very *object* of negotiation is to terminate and reconcile pending disputes, an avowed resolution to grasp with violence the subject of contention is to annihilate every possibility of negotiation.—France, consequently, *on this account*, (forgetting for a moment, her former aggressive conduct,) is, upon the principles of their own creed, responsible for the war which became inevitable, from her refusal to discontinue the acts of violence which produced it. These facts are more than sufficient to demolish the puny sophisms of those,

those, who would, in insolent defiance of truth, confidently assert that this country omitted to have recourse to amicable adjustment; and to shew, beyond the power of refutation, that France was *doubly* the author of the war.

It will, doubtless, be remarked, that in my attempts to clear away the rubbish which has been so industriously accumulated to prevent our discerning "*quo fonte derivata clades*," I have entirely confined my endeavours to shew, that the war was, on our part, merely *defensive*; and that it originated solely in the aggressions of France.

But though upon these principles alone, its justice and necessity stand upon a basis which demands the approbation of impartial men, still I will not deny, that it derived a considerable support from the reflection, that a political system was adopted in France which threatened the peace of all civilized countries, and which particularly menaced the existence of our own. It waged universal war against the laws and independence of Europe; it tore up by the roots, the sacred orders of the church, and persecuted



religion as the pest of mankind; it ravaged and profaned its holy altars, and either massacred or drove into exile, the whole body of its clergy; it industriously excited revolt in every neighbouring country; in a word, it cherished and propagated the most horrible anarchy that was ever let loose from hell for the destruction of every regular government,—and left no alternative but to crush or to be crushed.

We are not to be told that an opposition to this system of France, tended to subvert the sacred principle of national independence. No man will, for an instant, deny, that it is the peculiar privilege of every nation to exercise a supreme and exclusive jurisdiction, within her own domains, provided she does not act incompatibly with the safety of other states. But in the indefensible case of an abuse of this high privilege, there exists a code competent to the punishment of so aggravated a crime. It is to be found in the law of neighbourhood. A law

\* This law is expressly defined by Vattel, “If then, there is any where a nation of a restless and mischievous disposition, always ready to injure others, to traverse their designs, and to raise domestic troubles, it is not to be doubted that all the other nations have a right to join in order to repress, chastise, and

“ put

co-eval and co-extensive with the life and safety of Europe. It became indispensably necessary, therefore, that this law should take cognizance of a system, which threatened with destruction the whole fabric of civilized Europe. It was, consequently, a duty incumbent upon Great Britain, whose motto is (and I hope ever will be) "*Humani nil a me alienum puto*;" being, besides, a distinguished member of the great commonwealth of Europe, to exert every nerve to enforce this law, for the annihilation of the common enemy. As this law specifically affirms, that no nuisance shall be erected by one State to the prejudice of another, it was impe-

*"put it ever after out of its power to injure them."* He illustrates this truth by informing us, "that the conduct followed by Philip the 2d. King of Spain, was adapted to *"unite all Europe against him; and it was from just reasons that Henry the Great formed the design of humbling a power, formidable by its forces, and pernicious by its maxims."*

And further, "*If there be any that makes an open profession of trampling justice under foot, of despising and violating the rights of others, whenever it finds an opportunity, the interests of HUMAN SOCIETY will authorize all others to unite, in order to humble and chastise it."*

Vattel's Law of Nations, Book 2d. Chap. 4.—The whole chapter is worth reading, being particularly apposite to the present question.

**H** 4 **riously**

riously required by self-preservation, that Europe should, as the Magistrate entrusted with this sacred and important law, exact general obedience to it; and, being at once the asserter and avenger of its rights, to demolish a portentous and terrific structure which threatened to crush every well-organized Government. This important subject, however, has been treated with such incomparable ability by a writer, for whose memory I am filled with the most profound but melancholy veneration; who long held the highest rank in the world of philosophy and letters, but who has now, unfortunately for the instruction of his countrymen and the improvement of mankind, left a chasm, which will, I fear, long remain unfilled; that it were extreme arrogance to dwell longer upon it; I refer my readers, therefore, to Mr. \*Burke's "Two Let-

\* In presuming to pay this humble tribute to the memory of this illustrious orator and statesman, I am not influenced by the extravagant conceit, that I can add to the glory with which his name is clothed by the unanimous opinion of all competent judges. I merely indulge my own feelings. To do justice to that stupendous and almost boundless genius, to those prodigious stores of knowledge, and to that unrivalled mastery over language, which he possessed, would, indeed, require powers of eloquence granted but to few. —  
*Vir magnus, acer, memorabilis fuit, et in cujus laudes exequendas laudatore Cicerone opus fuerit.*

" ters



“ters on the Proposal for Peace, with the Regi-  
 “cide Directory of France,” from p. 112--130.  
 The lofty maxims of moral, civil, and political  
 wisdom, at once solid and unanswerable, which  
 are there seen, must strike with conviction  
 the heart of every fair and unprejudiced man.  
 I have been induced to touch thus slightly upon  
 this grand and momentous topic, merely with  
 a view to shew, that had not the war been ren-  
 dered just and necessary, by the unprovoked ag-  
 gressions of France; and afterwards strengthened  
 and confirmed by her refusal to conciliate them  
 by negotiation, *this law alone would have com-  
 pletely justified us in defending our rights, and*  
*those of civilized Europe, by an appeal to arms.*

“The writings of Mr. Burke,” says Mr.  
 Erskine, (p. 118.) “have had great and ex-  
 “tensive influence in producing and continuing  
 “this fatal contest.” The former part of this  
 sentence is false.—Mr. Burke was not directly  
 or indirectly instrumental in \*producing the  
 war.

\* For the truth of this declaration, I appeal to an autho-  
 rity beyond dispute. “Had I a mind,” (says Mr. Burke,  
 in his Letter to a noble Lord, page 79.) “to keep that high  
 “distinction

war. It sprung solely from the cruel ambition and insatiate rancour of France. To affirm the contrary would be, not only to oppose naked assertions to notorious facts, but to clothe him with the glory (if there be any) which belongs solely to Robespierre or to Brissot. The truth of the latter part it is the glory of his admirers to admit. But it is not alleged surely as matter of accusation against this enlightened statesman. It is, in our opinion, the highest, because justest, eulogy he can pay him. The perspicacious and aquiline eye of this extraordinary mind saw (the thick black clouds, pregnant with the blast of contagion and death, condense, and threaten

"distinction to myself," (not that of inciting Great Britain to commence the attack, but that of first instigating her to defend her assailed rights, and to take up the gauntlet when it had been insolently thrown down) "as from *pride* I might, "but from *justice* I dare not." &c. &c. — Again, "It would be a most arrogant presumption in me to assume to "myself, the glory of what belongs to his Majesty, and to "his Ministers, and to his Parliament, and to the far "greater *majority* of his faithful people: But *had* I stood "alone to consult, and that all were determined to be "guided by my advice, and to follow it implicitly—then I "should have been the sole author of a war." Conditional promises have not hitherto been esteemed synonymous with actual performances.

us with overwhelming destruction. \*He fore-  
told the storm that was brooding over the face  
of Britain, and summoned all the vast powers of  
his capacious and opulent mind, to warn her  
of her imminent danger, and of the necessity to  
prepare for the impending blow. With powers  
of eloquence rarely equalled among men, he  
raised the voice of his sublime genius, to soothe  
the warring elements of discord and faction, and  
to rouse her injured sons to the mighty contest.  
He succeeded—and continued to illumine, by  
his brilliant rays, our dreary passage through the  
gloomy dangers in which we were (and still are)  
involved, and though in the evening of his life,  
he shone with all the splendour of a meridian  
sun.

\* I can never contemplate the wonderful and almost su-  
per-human prescience of this universal genius, without be-  
ing deeply afflicted at the reflection, how each succeeding  
day seems to vie with its predecessor in fulfilling his early  
predictions of that destructive brood of crimes and miseries,  
(the natural offspring of all revolutions, built upon the  
ruins of all human and divine laws, and formed as the sport  
of atheism, rapine, and wanton massacre,) which are let  
loose to scourge and devour the whole human race; and  
without reflecting in how eminent a degree he possessed that  
talent, at which Cicero himself expresses his astonishment:

*Nescio quomodo inhæret in mentibus quasi SECLORUM quoddam  
augurium FUTURORUM—idque in maximis ingeniis altissimisque  
animis existit maximè et apparet facillime.*

Convinced



Convinced as Mr. Burke was, in common with all other men who are willing, to disrobe themselves of party prejudice, and to see, in their true light, the tyrannical aggressions of France, that justice exacted that we should take up arms in our own defence, he performed the noblest office of patriotic eloquence, in animating us to a war for our existence as a nation, and inspiring us with a magnanimity to protect our rights against the lawless rapacity of an inveterate foe. He struggled with the corruptions of party, and the shrinking timidity of some of his countrymen, and, like the ancient orator\* of Greece, rallied their scattered strength, and raised their drooping spirits.

It is, doubtless, highly incumbent upon every man whose mind, unclouded by the shades of party, will permit him to measure the magnitude of the impending danger, to root out of more contracted hearts every groveling and selfish sentiment, and to excite a vigorous co-operation in the common cause.—This is a task which

\* ——— “ Whose resistless eloquence

Wielded at will that fierce democratic,  
Shook th’ arsenal and fulmin’d over Greece  
To Macedon and Artaxerxes’ Throne.”

public

public virtue is indispensably bound to perform :  
 —none executed it with more religious fidelity  
 than this venerable orator ! But though weak  
 and wavering minds might stand in need of that  
 invigorating support and animating encourage-  
 ment which his magnanimous wisdom so trans-  
 cendantly enabled him to bestow, still such was  
 the self-evident justice of our cause, that the  
 most illiterate man in the nation, who had any  
 regard for his personal happiness, and the wel-  
 fare of his country, felt himself animated with  
 the firmest determination to resist, with his life,  
 the unmerited aggressions of the enemy. The  
 resentment of injury does not require the incite-  
 ment of eloquence, or the information of wis-  
 dom. It is a sensation implanted in the human  
 breast—it is deeply written in the heart of man  
 by the finger of nature—it is admirably described  
 by Cicero, as “ non scripta, sed nata lex, quam  
 “ non didicimus, accepimus, legimus, verum ex-  
 “ naturâ ipsâ arripuimus, hausimus, expressimus,  
 “ ad quam non docti, sed facti, non instituti,  
 “ sed imbuti sumus : ut si vita nostra in aliquas  
 “ insidias, si in vim, in tela aut latronum aut  
 “ inimicorum incidisset, omnis honesta ratio esset  
 “ expediendæ salutis.” —Orat. pro Milo.

It

It is not unworthy of incidental remark, that the war was looked upon in so just a light by the Opposition, that Mr. Fox did not divide the House upon its question;—a circumstance which, it will not be denied, he has frequently done upon more trivial occasions.—This can, I think, be accounted for only upon two grounds.

1st.—That the arguments in favour of the war were so forcible, that they preponderated in his mind. Or,

2nd.—That he saw the war was so popular, that he preferred the general sentiments of the public to his own private and individual opinion.

Mr. Fox, however, for this conduct participates in the obloquy indirectly cast, by his friend Mr. Erskine, upon those who approved of the origin of the war.—“Nothing,” says he, “is more distant from my temper, or my purpose, than to fasten the charge of *corruption* or *folly* upon *all* who were seized with this alarm, or who contributed to its propagation.” So far am I from imagining that its origin can be traced to the infectious fountain of corruption, I know



it is generally owned by the \*Jacobins themselves, that, had a reform in Parliament (their panacea for every political disease) taken place at the commencement of hostilities, the opinion of the justice of the war was so prevalent, that it would not have prevented it. And in answer to his opinion, that it proceeded from folly, we would ask, why he did not, under that conviction,

rise up in that assembly, of which he is a member, and employ his oratorical powers in exhorting his countrymen to shun the gulph of war; and in assuring them, that *they* were the

aggressors in the quarrel, and that their supposed insults were merely dreams of ignorance and delusion? Why did he not, like Ajax, stand single and alone, and, amid hosts of surrounding

foes, defend (according to his *published* tenets) the true cause of his country, by convincing her of her unwarrantable guilt, plunging into the horrors of unjust war?—To omit this was an unpardonable dereliction of public duty. He should have recollected, that, by this negligence, he was one of those, who, either from corruption

By this term I would wish to designate that class of men, who are most obstreperously clamorous for reform, in the hope of being able to conduct it to revolution.  
"tion

“tion or folly, contributed to its propagation;”—that in such a momentous case, not to dissuade was to encourage, and to encourage was to be instrumental in producing those calamities, which are its inseparable concomitants. There was no intermediate space which he could possibly occupy: to declaim against it would have been an *unequivocal* proof of his disapprobation of it:—to preserve silence was undeniably a more than *presumptive* proof of his conviction of its necessity and justice. It is, however, no difficult task to account for this seeming remissness and inconsistency of conduct—he was aware that the premises upon which he could build any argument were unsound and untenable; and that his feeble voice would have been lost amidst the indignant clamours of an injured and insulted people.

It is thus manifest that we had no refuge from instantaneous and ignominious ruin but in that kind of war which, for its virtue and justice, is sanctioned by ancient wisdom—“*Justum bellum quibus necessarium, et pia arma quibus nulla nisi in armis relinquitur spes.*”

## SECTION

## SECTION II.

## CHARGES OF DISASTER AND DISGRACE CONSIDERED.

**T**HAT no war can be long carried on without being attended with partial hardships, is a truth which unfortunately cannot be denied. The barometer of distress, however, is not a general fixed and immutable index.—It rises or falls according to the lightness or heaviness of particular and incidental circumstances. As it is not disputed that some degree of calamity is the inseparable concomitant of war, little credit is attached to the discovery, that it has not absented itself from the present. What is universally known cannot be subject of astonishment. Little fame is derivable to a man from the discovery that gay and festive peace, does not attend the car of grim and desolating war. The only enquiry, then, which intimately concerns us, is, whether the disheartening and deadening proclamation, which is so incessantly bellowed in our ears,—that distress and disgrace have, in their

I

utmost



utmost latitude, been constant companions of the present war, issues from the sacred temple of truth, or whether it is the fallacious assertion and senseless rant of designing and malicious minds.

There is a swarm of men, it must be observed, continually buzzing in the political atmosphere of this country, whose optics are so miserably distorted, that they either cannot, or will not, see things in their true and real state. They are perpetually representing the gay face of their country, as a scene of desolation and woe. These men, either from a personal jealousy or hatred of the Minister, or from an unnatural disaffection to their country, assiduously labour, to pervert the judgment of their less informed and unsuspicious countrymen, and to taint their susceptible minds with the fatal contagion of sedition. They feel themselves amply compensated for their exertions, if they are able to corrupt their loyalty, and "turn all their politics awry." The joyless visions of these malignant perverters should not, certainly, be hailed as the test of reality and truth; they should be despised by candour

candour as the dangerous precepts of rebellion,  
or as the infectious offspring of a disordered  
brain:

The success or miscarriage of a war, is a question of so versatile and undefinable a nature, that it defies the powers of ingenuity and wisdom to invent an invariable criterion, by which it may be judged. It is, necessarily, and entirely, dependent upon the cause of its origin; and although it is a subject which affords ample scope for the display of logical ability and dextrous sophistry, still it must be confessed, that no man should presume to pass judgment upon so momentous a thesis, without having carefully investigated the effects it has produced, and without steadfastly keeping in remembrance the primary cause of its commencement. As effects can be judged only by a consideration of their causes, so can the productions of a war be solely and rightly weighed by a reflection on its origin. This is the test by which every war should be judged. When I reflect upon the causes which forced us into the present war, I am led to remember, that it did not originate in the hope of conquering a pestilential island, or in the desire

of enriching ourselves with the spoils of a neighbour. It arose from the important and lawful motives of defending the violated rights of our ally, of punishing unprovoked indignities towards ourselves, and of checking the influx of principles dangerous to our existence.

It is a contemptible and petty triumph to announce, that the war has been expensive, and productive of considerable inconvenience ;—it is only giving us the new and important information, that gigantic labours are constantly attended with some degree of difficulty, and that costly pursuits are not in their nature expenceless. This is one of those puling arguments, that are only born to scream and to die. To suppose that an object of so stupendous a nature, as undeniably is war, can be pursued, for any length of time, without some partial evil, and even pinching hardships, were idiotical. What is not attainable should not be expected. To complain, then, that the golden days of unruffled prosperity do not smile upon us in the iron times of war—is only telling us, that war is not peace ; and seems equally preposterous as to feel irritated that vernal blossoms do not flourish in Autumn, or that autumnal fruit is not produced by Spring.

It



It should be considered, whether these troubles are severe in proportion to the magnitude of the danger, and whether it be not the part of wisdom cheerfully to endure them, when they are proved to be indispensably necessary to the prosecution of a contest for the preservation of our nearest and dearest interests.

It cannot but be remembered, that, at its first dawn, the comet of the French Revolution (which, from "its horrid hair shook pestilence and war," and "with fear of change perplexed monarchs") was hailed with rapture as the rising star of liberty; and, that *wise* men assembled from various parts to pay it their earliest adoration: though it rose with fiery aspect, and threatened instant destruction to every *kingdom*, still was its fascination so powerful to many, that they continued to greet it—the harbinger of perennial bliss—the cynosure of perpetual peace. So numerous, indeed, were its fervent admirers in this country at the commencement of hostilities, that loyalty seemed, for a time, to have been scared from her seat, and rebellion seemed rising to usurp her throne.

At that memorable æra, such was the fermentation of the public mind, that numerous associations were publicly formed, and factious societies barefacedly established, for the express purpose of altering the Constitution of our Country; it is equally well known, that they had entered into an open, avowed, impudent, and audacious correspondence with the usurping Government of France; that their object was no less than to abolish the ancient structure of our august Constitution, and to build in its place a foul, hideous system of impiety, anarchy and massacre, exactly similar to that which was desolating France. This dangerous conduct called for the indispensable vigilance of the civil power to check its rapid progress, and to endeavour to crush it by the lawful punishment of its abandoned prosecutors. I should willingly have omitted to touch upon this most delicate point, had I not found myself involuntarily urged by the triumphant manner in which Mr. Erskine takes every opportunity of alleging that, as some of the desperate members of this wicked faction were pronounced guiltless of the crime laid to their charge, the *cause* for which they were tried was justifiable and praise-worthy. He tells us, "that

“ that not a man had been then convicted, for any  
 “ *treason* against the State, though the laws have  
 “ been new cast and manufactured to reach  
 “ cases, which the venerable institutions of our  
 “ forefathers did not touch : and *no conspiracy*  
 “ *against the Government had then, or has to this*  
 “ *hour, been detected.*”\*

I have ever considered the character of an acquitted man, in some respects, as sacred : it may claim some exemption from the licentious freedom of public discourse ; it cannot, however, lay any restraint upon private opinion. Feeling the truth of these reflections, I would, at all times, rather pass over in silence, than enter into a painful examination of so tender a subject as these acquittals. But when I find them vauntingly displayed as a topic of triumph, love of truth compels me to examine the grounds of such exultation. It cannot be denied, that it frequently happens, that, owing to various and incidental causes, (such as, for example, the want of † *two* creditable witnesses) the charges exhi-

\* Page 19.

† “ *Unius* responso testis omnino non audiatur,” was the declaration of the civil law, and though disdained by France, has been sanctified by the approbation of all civilized ages,



bited against a man may not have been clearly proved, and that he consequently escapes the punishment which would otherwise have fallen upon him ; but nevertheless, that sufficient guilt may in the course of trial manifest itself to prove that the *malus animus*,—the *evil intention*, though it escaped with difficulty the gripe of justice, existed in the fullest force :—does it necessarily follow, then, that from the mere circumstance of the man's *acquittal* he is to be esteemed perfectly innocent, and that he has an undoubted right ever after to boast, that his virtue has baffled the cruelties which unjust power wished to inflict upon him?—By no means. And although it is not denied that, according to the *technicality* of law, acquittal implies that the man is guiltless of the crime alleged against him, and cannot be made to suffer, hereafter, punishment for that offence ; still it must be owned, that it is nothing more than a *presumption* of moral innocence, and that it does not infallibly carry with it the force of *demonstration*. A case may, indeed, happen, in which a man is accused of murder, but, owing to a deficiency of unambiguous proof, the charge fails of being brought home to him, and he is consequently acquitted : yet, in the course of his trial, incontestable proofs

present

present themselves of his commission of burglary, or other inferior crimes :—does it then follow, I ask, as a necessary consequence, that, owing to his acquittal from the first enormous charge, these less important stains are to be for ever wiped off, and the man is to be esteemed a spotless character ?

I would give it as my opinion, though painful is the task, that, although Mr. Erskine is correct in his assertion, “ that no man had *then* “ been convicted for any *treason* against the “ State,” still he is informed by the dictates of his own heart, that, although from the extreme difficulty of proving the overt act of treason, assisted by other collateral causes, the accused escaped the imputation of *traitors*, and the consequent ignominious punishment ; yet, that the most irrefragable proofs testified that the most flagrant conspiracies existed for the utter destruction of the whole body of British laws, civil and ecclesiastical ; and that *sedition* was visibly exerting herself to undermine the foundation of the British Constitution. It is an undeniable fact, so unequivocal was the atrocity of their intentions, that, although *treason* narrowly eluded the

the arm of justice, from the difficulty attending its identification, still *sedition* so manifestly and even triumphantly appeared, that, had *this* been the charge made against them, so undoubted was their guilt, and so evident was *this* crime, they could not have escaped condign punishment. With what justice then can Mr. Erskine make the declaration, " That the object which gave the real offence was virtuous and laudable ? " \* To me it seems absurd, unless it be meant to proclaim that a cruel and unnatural attempt to hack in pieces our venerable parent—the British Constitution, should be esteemed the infallible proof of filial piety and patriotic virtue.

Here it is impossible, that a sentiment of admiration should not strike across the mind of every man, upon reflecting on the unexampled mildness of the English laws. Though the malice of the design was but too visible, yet, as the charges could not be clearly and unquestionably proved, the *law* instantly became their tutelary goddess. She covered them with her shield; she protected them from further injury. These are inherent virtues which defy the jurisprudence

\* P. 20.



of any country to exhibit a parallel :—They form a striking and glorious contrast to that *infernal* justice in France, (whose customs, manners, and consequently code of laws, these very men were striving to introduce), which, after the example of Rhadamanthus, makes the infliction of punishment a preparatory step to the examination of guilt,

What I have advanced is not, unfortunately, a mere assertion. It is an undeniable fact. And in order to prove the truth of Mr. Erskine's assertion, that "no conspiracy against the Government had then, *or has to this hour* been detected," I would merely recall to his recollection the existence of the Corresponding\* Society, (of which these acquitted worthies were members)—a heterogeneous mixture of the dregs and scum of the community, collected from all parts of the kingdom, and attracted to one point of Union, for the undisguised purpose of demo-

\* I by no means wish to avail myself of the powerful support to my argument, which the recent Report of the Secret Committee of the House of Commons affords, as I do not feel myself authorised to draw conclusions from any other premises than what were common to Mr. Erskine, and notorious to all men,

lishing

lishing the glorious edifice of the British Constitution; and of raising from its ruins all the horrid calamities and systematic cruelties of the tyranny miscalled a Government in France.

Nor could Mr. Erskine be ignorant, when he was asserting, that our apprehensions were entirely groundless, and that the utmost cause of alarm consisted in a few libels, written by a few "misguided *individuals*," that, not only a few misguided *individuals*, but every member of the Corresponding Society (undeniably a large body of men, not to mention their perfect concord, and union, with other gangs of Seditious Conventiclers) without a single exception, had given their sanction to the following positions: (I shall content myself with selecting a few, to shew to what length they pushed their daring insolence)—  
 "That there is no such thing as a Constitution in this country, though it is much *talked about*, no such thing as a Constitution exists, or ever did exist; and consequently the people have a *Constitution yet to form*."—That, "The right of war and peace resides in a metaphor shewn in the Tower for sixpence or a shilling a piece." It is audaciously asked, "What is this metaphor  
 called

called a Crown, or rather what is Monarchy?" Is it a thing, or is it a name, or is it a *fraud*? Does it operate like Fortunatus's wishing cap, or Harlequin's wooden sword? Does it make a man a conjuror? It appears to be a *something* going much out of fashion, falling into ridicule and rejected in *some* countries both as *unnecessary and expensive*." "That aristocracy is a monster."—That, "The romantic and barbarous distinction of men into Kings and subjects, though it may suit the conditions of Courtiers, cannot that of Citizens; and is exploded upon the principles upon which *Governments are now founded*."—That, "The estimation of the revolution (they mean the glorious revolution of 1689, not their grim and hideous gallic idol) is upon the wane, eclipsed by the enlarging orb of reason," (they exhilarate and rouse the flagging spirits of their less abandoned fellow-conspirators, by assuring them that) "In less than another century it will go to the family vault of all the Capulets."—O incredibilem audaciam! O impudentiam prædicandam! And, "That the bill of rights is a bill of wrongs." I shall not descend to refute libels so outrageously atrocious, and so palpably false. They beggar invective. I leave them



them to the sober reflection of every well-born mind. They clearly refute however, Mr. Erskine's assertion, that, "No conspiracy against the Government had been detected."\*

I will not permit myself to suspect, that Mr. Erskine, when he affirms, that, "The laws have been new cast, and manufactured to reach cases which the venerable institutions of our forefathers did not touch," has any allusion to the two bills found requisite to be enacted, the one for the † protection of his Majesty's person against

\* Page 20.

† I have often been astonished at that strange outcry which has been frequently raised against this most salutary and necessary law. Although Majesty has no peculiar prerogative against the arm of fate, it is surely the indispensable duty of a loyal and affectionate people, to unite in their exertions to form a strong shield for its protection against the malignant arts of disloyalty. Every blow levelled at the head of the Sovereign is, in its effects, levelled at the national establishment; and it should be seriously considered, that the Father of a People seldom falls by the hand of rebellion, without involving the whole country in desolation and blood. Though it be possible that the tyrannical conduct of a Prince, may be carried to such an intolerable excess, that it may be justifiable, and even laudable, for the \* people to rise in a body and depose him, still it cannot be

\* As in the case of James the Second.

proved

against the sacrilegious attacks of wild and enthusiastic jacobins : the other for the suppression of

proved that an *individual* has a right to do this :—Whence does he acquire his prerogative ? The boldness of Flavius the Tribune, so finely described by Tacitus, may probably command our admiration, but his conduct must ever be condemned. “ Dein postquam urgebatur, confessionis gloriam amplexus, interrogatusque de Nerone, quibus causis ad oblivionem sacramenti processisset : “ Oderam te, inquit ; nec quisquam tibi fidelior militum fuit, dum amari meruisti. “ Odisse cœpi, postquam parricida matris et uxoris, auriga, et histrio, et incendiarius, extitisti.” Though no man would undertake to plead the cause of the sanguinary tyrant Nero, still Flavius could have no possible excuse for his heinous offence, as the person of the \*Prince is in no case punishable by the hand of the subject.—By the Senate alone were his crimes to be judged : as was afterwards the case when it condemned him to be punished *more majorum*. Had the attempt of Flavius been crowned with success, he would have merited to be punished as a traitorous assassin, as the conduct of the Prince does not excuse the moral guilt of the murdering subject. If then the crime be unpardonable in the case of this execrable despot, in what language shall we describe the atrocity of that wretch, who would dare to lift his arm (the very augury is to be abominated), against a Sovereign, who is the father of his people, and the characteristic of whose reign is an incessant tenderness and care for the happiness of his people.

\* A caviller will perhaps remark, that Nero was not, rigidly speaking, an *Emperon*, but commander of the army ; (Imperator) he cannot however deny, that he was the *head* of the Roman Empire, which is sufficient for my argument.

Upon

of these seditious meetings, at a time when they were carried to such outrageous lengths, that they

Upon this question I cannot agree with Mr. Horne (Tooke), "It was thought," \* he says, "a daring expression of Oliver Cromwell, in the time of Charles the First, that if he found himself placed opposite the King in battle, he would discharge his piece into his bosom as soon as into any other man's." "I go farther, (says Parson Horne), had I lived in those days, I would not have waited for chance to give me an opportunity of doing my duty, I would have sought him through the ranks, and, without the least personal enmity, have discharged my piece into his bosom, *rather* than into any other man's." He would vindicate this conduct by telling us, that "the King, whose actions justify rebellion to his Government, deserves death from the hand of every subject." In the case of rebellion, we would ask him, Who are to be the judges of the actions of the Monarch? Are the capricious rebels themselves, inflamed by passion, and by the artful machinations of designing demagogues, and fired with revenge for real, or perhaps, imaginary evils, (a lawless rabble, who one day may clamorously call for the death of their Sovereign, and the next may be disgusted with their new and self-created governors, and may glut themselves with the blood of *his* murderers.) Are they, we ask, capacitated to judge in so difficult a cause, and in the possible case of the innocence of the King, and their own wretched delusion, to rake their sacrilegious hands in his bowels, and thus drown their country in civil war? Or, are the leaders of a rebellion presumed to be calm and unprejudiced judges?—Men who, rarely scrupulous respecting the *means* by which they gain the sum-

\* Junius, Letter LIII.



they seemed almost to nose justice in her judgment seat.

In the safety of the people certainly consists the political liberty of a State. Their duration

is  
mit of their ambition, and irritated at the obstruction which the existence of their Sovereign forms to their desperate designs, will easily accuse him of crimes of which he is not guilty, or punish, by a cruel and unmerited death, those little defects from which humanity, however elevated its station, has never yet been known to be totally exempt. Would any man, in the possession of his reason, consult the insolent and unfeeling Bradshaw, or the audacious usurper Cromwell, upon the innocence or guilt of the unfortunate Charles? Or would they look upon the sanguinary Rober-spierre as a calm and sober judge of the *alleged* (certainly not proved) crimes of the ill-fated Louis? To descend to more common cases,—In the case of individual quarrels, does the law of England allow a man to be the judge in his own cause, and, in the moment of inconsiderate passion, to punish perhaps a trifling affront with instant death? Whence, then, proceeds this deprivation of (what may appear to a superficial observer, a man's natural right,) the privilege of personally punishing injury sustained?—From the wise and philosophical conviction, that the beautiful definition which Aristotle gives of law—*the mind without passion*, is equally appropriate to a Judge; who is fitted and qualified for the discharge of his sacred duties, solely by the equal absence of love and hatred.”—As every country does not possess such a despotic officer as the Justiza of Arragon, to scan with invidious and malignant eye the Royal conduct, what authority is to decide in the delicate, doubtful, and ~~lawful~~ case of rebel-

is co-equal ; destroy one, the other must fall.

Though the remark of Coke is most just, that

“ it

lion deemed justifiable?—The \* *general will* of the whole nation, calmly and clearly ascertained. Such judges, after having found from the most impartial examination and sober reflection, that the charges of guilt are well-founded, will not deliver up the royal culprit, as an animal to be baited, to the wanton cruelty of some abandoned and barbarous desperado, but will award that punishment which is becoming the injured dignity of a civilized nation. Thus absurd then is the doctrine of the inherent *individual* right of inflicting spontaneous punishment ; and although Mr. Horne fortifies his argument by a declaration, which, I trust, no man who knows any thing of his character and disposition will be inclined to disbelieve, that “ should such a time (a rebellion similar to that of Charles 1st.) arrive, he shall be as free to *act* as to say,” still I confess (though I by no means wish to insinuate, that my scepticism inclines me to doubt the noble feats of Mr. Horne’s heroism, in the cause of anti-Royalism) I cannot perceive that a man’s deserving punishment necessarily furnishes every other man with a full right of inflicting it, which is the law Mr. Horne seems willing to lay down, and which would afford unbounded scope for the wildest freaks of popular licentiousness. To illustrate, how-

\* A definition of this term may be found in the note to page 13. But it must be obvious, that this reasoning cannot have any application to this country ; the British Constitution having in the most enlightened policy and profoundest wisdom, withdrawn all responsibility from the *Crown*, and unalterably reposed it in *its servants*.—A principle so peculiarly calculated to diffuse universal true liberty cannot be sufficiently venerated. I am now considering, by the test of *equity* and reason, the *general* case of the royal conduct being cognizable by individual judgment,

ever,

“ it is the phyfic of Government to let out corrupt blood,” it muft ftill be granted that, as the very object of law is the prevention of crime, and as “ the † *dread of evil* operates more forcibly

ever, this point, by a fimple analogy—Let us *suppofe* the cafe of Mr. Horne having committed an offence, for which it was thought, by the well-dispofed part of the community, that he deferved death by the ignominious hand of the hangman; does he mean to aver, that the mere circumftance of that defert would fully entitle *any man* to the privilege of hoift- ing him à la lanterne? I think not. If then this rule be inapplicable to a private individual, how much more muft it be with refpect to the auguft perfon of a Sovereign, whose fall muft naturally fhake the empire to its center. Who but a wild defpot would dare to clothe himfelf with the power of a whole nation, and, in the frantic hour of paffion and caprice, affume to himfelf the licence of performing an act, which is *exclusively* to be determined by the *general will* of a nation?—This rule is, even in theory, prepofterous; in practice it would be abfolutely intolerable.—“ It is,” to ufe his own words, “ the very extremity of faction, and the laft degree of wickednefs.”

The pious ethics of venerable fages are generally taught in the fchools. I have not yet heard, however, that this law has been recommended in either of our univerfities, to the ftudy and attention of the rifing juris confults. I conjecture, that it may be adopted in the new college of the rights of man. It has not yet (thank God!) been ingrafted upon our national jurisprudence.

I cannot, indeed, poffibly imagine what could have inspired

\* State Trials, Vol. 1. p. 235.

† Locke, on the Human Underftanding, B. 2. ch. xxi.



eibly on the mind, than the expectation of good," it is the part of a wise Government to endeavour to prevent, by the frightful image of severe penalty, those atrocities, for which, when perpetrated, it is reduced to the melancholy necessity of inflicting punishment. This wise and virtuous object is necessarily defeated, if punishments are so slight that they are looked upon with indifference and scorn. It is, therefore, not only justifiable, but highly laudable in a State, to endeavour to measure the penalty

spired this holy man with so unhallowed a sentiment. Had he lived in the neighbourhood of Diana's temple, at Aricia, I could easily have accounted for it; since we are informed that the murderer of the Chief Priest instantly became his *\*successor*. This would have been personal ambition. But in the case of *Regicide*, he could not surely have been biased by similar views; for notoriously spotless as may be his character, and numerous as may be his friends among the *Sovereign People*, it was not within the range of probability, that he would have been invested with the imperial purple. Whatever may be the motives which gave birth to this declaration, the knowledge that "Horne's situation did not correspond with his intentions" cannot have failed to cause universal exultation.

\* Fanum in luco est, et perfuga, sacerdos ibi constituitur, qui sacerdotem, suâ trucidaverit manu, strictoque semper gladio paratus ad insultus propulsandos circumspicit.

Strab. Geog. lib. v.

by

by the malignity of the crime. For, since the safety of the public is the supreme rule of all policy, and since the public is entrusted to the guardianship of the *law* alone, the law is guilty of a criminal neglect of duty, and the public security is imminently endangered, if measures are not always taken to smother a conspiracy, which, if nourished by indifference and inattention, invisibly acquires strength, to burst out with the irresistible fury of a volcanic irruption, and to bury all law and liberty with its lava. Instead, then, of arraigning laws that are neither unjust nor cruel, but which are found necessary to the security and even existence of the empire; it is, perhaps, rather to be lamented, that the mild spirit of Britain will not permit her to inflict some *servile supplicium* proportioned to the flagitiousness of the crime; and by those means to crush a horrid gang of conspirators, whose desires are bounded only by the destruction of our invaluable Constitution; and by the extermination of all the lovers of order, liberty and law. The measures which were found necessary to be adopted, were, besides, sanctioned by the high authority of Locke himself, who expressly affirms, (notwithstanding his notorious

tenderness for popular toleration) "that no *opi-  
nions* contrary to human society, or to those  
moral rules which are necessary to the preser-  
vation of civil society, *are to be tolerated by the  
magistrate.*"\* Though perhaps captious cavillers  
may object to this decision as too undefined in  
its nature, and as promoting the cause of into-  
lerance and oppression, still it *must* be confessed,  
that an objection to it, cannot, in this case,  
boast the smallest foundation:—As opinions  
were industriously propagated (and in some cases  
most barefacedly acted upon) which could only  
prosper by the destruction of the moral system,  
and which were undeniably baneful to the very  
essence of civil society. These seasonable laws  
could be galling solely to the machinations of  
lurking treason, and consequently were indis-  
pensably necessary to the existence and salvation  
of the State.—They can defy the most un-  
bridled free-thinker to affirm, that their justice  
was not ratified by dire necessity.

Such being the formidable and deep-laid plots  
of a vast body of malignant and desperate sedi-

\* First Letter concerning Toleration.



tionists in this country, (colonists, as it were, of jacobinical France) they only waited the encouraging nod of the mother country of sedition, to put their cruel designs into instant execution.\*—The contaminated river was, at this time, rapidly forcing its way to form a junction with the source of anarchy and regicide, and then with overwhelming torrent, to deluge the surrounding country, and to throw down every structure that graced its beauteous banks. Its course was happily turned by a circumstance which, of all others, would be the least suspected to be productive of fortunate consequences.—A circumstance no other than WAR.—War was the skilful hand which amputated the gangrened limb, and saved the patient's life. That war, without complete victory, should be productive of real and instantaneous advantage, is a paradox, which, at first sight, seems irreconcilable to experience, and is certainly by no means likely

\* I deem it necessary to observe, that this section was written prior to the publication of the Report of the Secret Committee of the English House of Commons, which discloses the real views of these pestiferous societies, and strongly confirms the position I am endeavouring to establish.

to command immediate and intuitive assent.— It is a phenomenon which was reserved for the close of the 18th century: and that which is generally deprecated as the source of calamity and ruin, should be hailed by Britain as her protector and her friend.

These are no visionary assertions; they are no chimerical speculations. Their truth is amply, though miserably, proved by a retrospective glance at the present situation of the continental powers: it will be found, that those whose servile apostacy made them quit a confederacy originating in duty and personal safety, are now lamenting their severe but highly-merited fate. It will be found, that those whose listless and torpid supineness suffered them to be lulled into dormant insecurity by the bewitching syrens of France, are now mourning their short-sighted and self-hostile policy.

Though Holland was roused into resentment, by unprovoked injuries, still permitting herself to view with a magnifying eye the partial evils inseparable from a state of war, and to be fascinated

nated with the treacherous allurements of France, the sunk with fatal indolence into the deadly arms of gallic fraternity. Had not the minds of the Dutch been polluted with the morbid (though to superficial minds inviting) charms of Utopian liberty, the conquest of their territory by the simple assistance of the frozen Wael would have been impracticable:—Its attempt would have been attended with failure and derision. They would sooner have imitated the heroic conduct of their ancestors, who, rather than basely submit to the yoke of Louis XIV. would have consigned their territories to the ocean, and have retired to their colonial settlements. Animated with this magnanimous resolution, and blessed with the counsel of the immortal William, they scornfully resisted the allurements of seduction and saved Holland. The miscarriage of the first attempt of the French in 1792, (which may, in truth, be greatly ascribed to the provident and strenuous exertions of the British Ambassador) sufficiently evinces, that had it been in the power of force to preserve them, then, the United Provinces would now be in the possession of their rightful masters.



masters. The contagion of incorporeal disaffection had, however, produced what the utmost physical strength would have been unable to resist. The consequences are before us. They are not hid in the bosom of futurity.—We behold, with affliction and alarm, Holland, once the chief emporium of Europe, now display all the horrors of a \* plundered country. Here chilling

\* A few days after the French had marched into Holland, their Commissioners published a proclamation, in which they said to the Dutch, “ In the midst of war, we consider you as our friends and allies : it is under this name we enter your country. We seek not to terrify, but to inspire you with confidence. It is but a few years since a tyrannic Conqueror prescribed your laws ; we abolish them, and restore your *freedom*.”

“ We come not to make you slaves, the French shall preserve to you your *independence*.”

“ Personal safety shall be secured, and property protected.”

Seven days, however, after these kind and friendly assurances, the same Commissioners, being admitted into all the towns with their troops, and having obtained complete possession of the country, thought this the seasonable moment to lay aside the mask. A second proclamation was accordingly published, in which they formally *required* the Dutch Government, to furnish the army, within *one month*, with the following supplies, viz. “ 200,000 quintals of wheat, 500,000 rations of hay, 200,000 rations of straw, 500,000 bushels of corn, 150,000 pair of shoes, 20,000

“ pair

ing poverty reigns in all its terrors. The empire of commerce, so lately flourishing with wealth and splendor, is now dwindled into a nest for vagrants, and haunt for villains. The virtuous and august conclave the States-General, has been converted into a gang of free-booters and Septembrizers, chosen by France herself, the † mother of monsters, out of that hellish crew whose sole qualification is superiority in vice.— Their office is to devise the plan, and to sanction the execution of every crime. And that injured Prince the Stadtholder, whose ancestors have, in more than one instance, saved Holland from the iron yoke of a foreign power, and

“ pair of boots, 20,000 coats and waistcoats, 40,000 pair of breeches, 150,000 pair of pantaloons, 20,000 shirts, and 50,000 hats. And besides all these, 12,000 oxen, to be delivered in *two months*.” This modest requisition they called their “ amicable intentions,” and in the “ execution of which,” they hoped that the slow forms of ordinary administration, and all doubts about the wants of authority, which might impede the operation, would be cheerfully set aside;—they at the same time gave the Dutch to understand, that in case these articles were not *cheerfully* supplied, force would be employed to *exact* them. It is almost unnecessary to add, that they were obliged to be granted, and only led to more severe exactions. I only mention this as *one* example of their rapacious devastation.

† Ferax monstrorum.

whose

whose dignified office is proved by the history of the United Provinces to be absolutely essential to their prosperity, (which should have been an useful lesson to these wicked fools, if they had not been above all caution and experience) has been ignominiously driven into exile, to make room for the insolent pro-consul placed over them by France, as an agent of tyranny and patron of plunder. This miserable country furnishes us with an awful example of the destructive folly of neglecting *real* and solid freedom for the pursuit of the shadowy phantom, false and speculative liberty, and (if it be decorous parvis componere magna) irresistibly reminds us of the frogs in the fable, who, not content with the ruler under whom they enjoyed happiness, implored Jupiter for another, who soon made them repent of their fatal captiousness—

—Tum misit illis hydram, qui dente aspero  
Corripere cœpit singulas.

If we turn our eyes to Spain, we shall there see the same calamitous consequences. The soft enchanting looks of *Circean* friendship dispelled the temporary gloom attendant upon war, but they hatched into life the embryos of destruction.



tion. The cause which they so lately boasted to be chivalrous and noble, was now despised as ignominious, and banished with contempt: and the Sardonian smile of France was rapturously courted as the talisman of eternal protection from slavery and war. What are the rewards of this short-sighted apostacy?—The lofty and arrogant monarchy of Spain, which had taken so many centuries to recover from the desolating barbarities of the Vandals and the Goths, and which once threatened to grasp within its ambitious arms the whole domination of Europe, is now suddenly sunk (*virtually* if not literally) to the abject state of a Gallic province. Its Crown is substantially a fief of jacobin France, and the tenure by which it is held is most galling and dreadful dependence: and the haughty Castilian, who so lately in his opinative pre-eminence looked down with disdain upon every surrounding nation, can now only boast himself the obedient slave of the over-bearing and despotic Gaul:—a tyrant who rivals in brutality, and seems to take for a model, the truculent barbarian Attila, “the scourge of God, the destroyer of nations.” The King trembles for his tottering throne, and, feeling its foundation undermined

undermined by those fatal combustibles—level-  
ling principles, waits, in awful and hourly ex-  
pectancy, its final subversion. The demolition  
of the feeble and declining inquisition, will be  
amply replaced by the more destructive reign of  
irreligion and atheism; and the infrequent and  
partial cruelties of an auto da fe will be fully  
compensated by the luxuries of a massacre.

The power which next claims our notice, as  
the former avowed enemy, but now reconciled  
friend of France—Prussia, may not, perhaps, be  
said to have so severely suffered as her compa-  
nions in apostacy. The progress of revolution-  
ary principles has not *seemingly* made so deep an  
impression upon that nation; that is not, how-  
ever, to be attributed to any want of inclination  
on the part of her new friend, but is to be ac-  
counted for solely from the warlike spirit of her  
people; it affords us a striking and useful exam-  
ple of the adequate efficacy of firmness and cou-  
rage to the resistance of a danger, under which  
relaxation of vigour must necessarily sink. The  
King of Prussia (it is obvious that I allude to the  
father of the present Monarch) beheld, with in-  
decent apathy, his rich territories on the Rhine  
plundered

plundered by his new friends, and his people, from his indifference to their interests and happiness, were forced to submit to the galling yoke of a rigid government, and to the cruel exactions of an hostile irruption.

It may be recollected, that the French entered Belgium under solemn and repeated promises of protection and freedom. In order to their faithful performance, the first step they took was to put every article of property which could be useful to their armies, into requisition, and compelled the people to receive payment in depreciated assignats at par. They next levied immense pecuniary \* contributions on all the towns; and ordered measures to be taken for *compelling* the people to exchange their assignats

\* For a more particular and detailed account of the wretchedness of Belgium, and, indeed, of all the other countries which are now bleeding under the sword of despotic France, I refer my readers to the *Mercure Britannique* of M. Mallet du Pan. And I must here beg leave to express the obligations I am under to that nervous writer and profound politician, for the instruction and entertainment I have received from a publication which is so peculiarly qualified to open the eyes of Europe to the unspeakable miseries which surround her.

at



Thus were professions of friendship realized by acts of the most rigorous clemency. This is, however, but a faint sketch of their lawless and abandoned conduct towards this deluded people. They may exclaim, I think, with greater justice than did the insane citizens of Argos—  
 “Pol me occidistis, amici, non servastis.”

In the fate of Genoa we recognise the danger of dull security within the prospect of imminent danger; we behold also the respect of France towards neutral nations proved by a forced alliance, secured by the presence of French garrisons, and ratified by an exacted declaration of war against Great Britain. I fear no Andrew Doria will be soon found to rescue his wretched country from the ignominious weight of a foreign yoke, and to merit, by his unambitious magnanimity, the venerable name of “Father of his Country, and Restorer of its Liberty.”

The Grand Duke of Tuscany is rewarded for his blind confidence in the marauders of his dome.

† See decree of 15th December, 1792, and the instructions to the Commissioners, dated 8th January, 1793.

extending prey, and amiable for the posture  
 purity of the manners, whose entangled frame

minions, by the seizure of his territories; and by the necessity of flying from the guillotine of French philanthropy.

We see Venice, so long the respected ally of France, mourning the loss of her most considerable cities, struggling between the grasp of contending ravagers, and contemplating, with heart-felt sorrow, on the destruction of her former Government,

If we turn our eyes to Rome, what a miserable spectacle shall we there behold! The empire of the fine arts now ravaged by the modern Saracens, in the wanton ferocity of ignorance and pillage. How affecting to every civilized mind to reflect, that this country, consecrated by the soul-enchancing pencil of a Virgil, and by the refined pen of a Horace, the seat of the Muses, which has ever since been blessed by their inspiring presence, should now suddenly be metamorphosed into the den of gothic barbarity. What indignation must we feel at that atrocious brutality, which could load with unmerited sufferings a Pontiff, venerable for his exemplary piety, and amiable for the spotless purity of his manners; whose enfeebled frame

L

sinking

sinking under the crushing weight of extreme age and extreme sorrow, could not move the pity of his unrelenting enemies, but only roused their violence, to drive him from possessions, which had been enjoyed by his predecessors for near one thousand years, and which, for an uninterrupted series of near three centuries, had remained tranquil and undisturbed amid innumerable shocks of surrounding war; and to hurl him and the whole body of his clergy into miserable exile, the only refuge from torture and death. To such bold, turbulent, and seditious intriguers as the Cardinal Buon Campagna are these distresses to be ascribed. When governments relax from that vigour which is inseparable from their existence, and sleep upon the brink of a precipice, there are never wanting dangerous and desperate conspirators to plunge them into ruin.

Their unprovoked brutality towards the peaceable Swiss, sprung from a malignant spirit of wanton hostility which beggars invective. This brave and harmless people, enjoying a constitution whose natural beauties were secured and strengthened by the primitive purity and unoffending



sending simplicity of their manners, permitted, with a blind and fatal patience, France to interfere in their national concerns. Their credulity was soon and cruelly punished; for these universal robbers, taking advantage of the moment of an armistice, wantonly and furiously attacked them; and they had the anguish to behold their adored constitution scornfully torn to atoms. This gallant people, did not, however, suffer their enemies to glut themselves with pilage unchecked by resistance, but with that real courage and inherent magnanimity for which they were deservedly renowned, (though uncultivated for near two centuries) they rushed like a mountain torrent upon their lawless invaders, and for a moment seemed to succeed in their virtuous struggle;—but alas! that valour was too late. Credulity and conspiracy had formed too strong a league to be dissolved by this ill-timed and fatally procrastinated effort. Their few but gallant warriors, betrayed by their own unnatural countrymen, were overwhelmed, though unsubdued, by innumerable tribes of sanguinary ruffians; and fell, worthy of the descendants of the heroic Tell, gloriously de-

\* I speak of them as a Nation.

sending the rights of their injured country; and  
 that Helvetic confederacy, under whose smiles  
 prosperity and peace had flourished in peren-  
 nial vigour, was trampled upon by insatiate  
 rapacity, and converted into a receptacle for  
 revolutionary principles and for desolating war.  
 Jacobinism is now celebrating, with savage  
 triumph, her conquest over the fallen and de-  
 graded Malta. The palace of chivalry is now  
 become the den of Gallic barbarism. The ci-  
 tadel of christianity has been basely *betrayed* into  
 the grasp of murderous atheism; and the ban-  
 ner of the cross is now indignantly hurled from  
 the ramparts to make room for the bloody flag  
 of infidelity.

The consequences which have been produced  
 by the unbridled licentiousness of the Sardinian  
 conspirators, furnish an awful but invaluable  
 lesson to the rulers of every state. Permitted, by  
 the supineness of an impotent government, to  
 celebrate with triumph the orgies of sedition;  
 these abhorers of law and order quickly ac-  
 quired sufficient strength and audacity to court  
 and receive the assistance of the systematic ra-  
 vagers of empires. The indolence of the go-  
 vernment

vernment matured the machinations of treason. The miserable Tetrarch, panick-struck at the first appearance of disaster, (which his vigilance and energy could easily have averted) basely resigned his fortresses, and ignominiously hypothecated in trust to the natural subverters of all well-ordered States, the very capital of his dominions. Thus delivering into the grasp of insatiate France the keys of Italy. For this vile cowardice, and indifference to the interests of his subjects and of himself, the powerless King was at length driven to the galling necessity of sneaking out of his dominions to make room for the usurpers of his throne :—the only alternative from the knives of his perfidious regicide friends.

Their recent and uncoloured hostility towards Naples, closes the brief and rapid description of that bloody and tragic picture, which these malign artists are preparing to finish, but of which they have, as yet, traced only the outline. I cannot omit, however, to remark, that had the Neapolitan King been assisted in his laudable and spirited anticipation of a long premeditated and imminent attack upon his do-

minions, The violence of the go-



millions, by those whose duty and *interest* it is to strain every nerve to check the incursions of the barbarians of Gaul, this ill-fated country had probably been saved from the afflictions under which she now writhes, and had been spared the anguish of beholding, I fear, her degradation triumphantly celebrated by a revival of the old tragedy of the Sicilian Vespers, performed by different, and in that line, certainly more experienced, actors. By this heroic action, however, he has greatly atoned for the reprehensible imitation of his ancestors in flying from his kingdom, when he might, perhaps, have infused system and order into a confused but intrepid multitude, who seemed to want only their King to lead them to the glorious office of crushing the ancient enemies of their country. It is perfectly natural that such a *patriotic* action should call forth the slanders of that blood-thirsty crew, who sit amongst us like vultures anxiously waiting for the day of carnage, and who, delighted with every thing which seems to accelerate their reign, "grin horribly a ghastly smile" when a virtuous monarch is hurled from his throne, and when an august empire is battered into ruins.—I envy not the feelings of that man

who

who can look with indifference upon the misfortunes of the royalists of Naples, and sincerely hope that it will not be imagined, that I have any disposition to violate the sacredness of misery, when I express my regret, that the unfortunate Ferdinand suffered himself to be, so long lulled to rest by the delusive amicable professions of those who are the sworn enemies of all crowned heads; and that he kept so slack a rein upon those daring seditionists, who were in alliance with them:—a conduct which certainly nourished and matured a hideous conspiracy, which waited only for the instant that legions of revolutionary assassins should thunder at the gates of his capital, to burst out in an irresistible and devastating irruption.

Even the peaceable disposition of the little republic of Lucca was no protection to her from the cruel talons of those rapacious vultures, who feed solely upon the vitals of well-regulated States. Distracted at the subversion of her inoffensive government, and at the plunder of her wealthy magazines, she views, with unutterable anguish, prosperity and peace banished from her territories, whilst war and desolation usurp their

dominion.—Industrious as she is, she will no longer be permitted to gather the fruits of her diligence. The fair promise of her harvest is blighted by the pestilence from Gaul. She may sow, but she will not reap—

— Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.

Italy, so luxuriantly formed in the gaiety of nature, we find now portioned out into lots of petty but formidable jacobin-republics,\* all indebted to France for miserable existence, and destined to be the seminaries of vice, from which she may occasionally derive refreshing draughts of strength. The Cisalpines and Transalpines, with all the swarms of republics as yet unfinished, but visibly chalked out by the most truculent enemy of peace that was ever yet known to desolate the earth, are the powerful instruments by which this jacobin giant intends to subvert and plunder all Europe.—France may

\* It will be said, perhaps, that Italy comprehended many republics before its conquest by France: it must, however, be recollected that their governments, though nominally republican were in reality aristocratic. This word has been, and still is, most egregiously misapplied: It seems, however, to be consecrated by custom. The only modern form of government, perhaps, which had a claim to the ancient title of Republic was that of Holland.

indeed



indeed now boast, that she has surpassed even the Huns in her devastations in the garden of Europe; she may now vaunt that she has converted it into a howling desert, haunted by the demon of bloody war, with his hideous satellites—Famine, Rapine, and Massacre!

These recent examples are, surely, more than sufficient to illustrate the baneful effects of jacobin principles. They present to us the heart-rending spectacle of countries, so lately blooming in the pride and vigour of life, suddenly dropping to the ground, blighted by the pestilential breath of France. The truth of the historian's observation, *Pax servientibus gravior quam liberis bellum*, must strike us with irresistible force. And had we not the same reason to expect similar consequences, had we imitated States who adopted similar measures? What grounds have we to suppose, that if we, like these impotent powers, had suffered ourselves to be bewitched by the same syren charms, we should not have experienced the same disastrous fate? The same mortal cause must have produced the same deadly effects. We ran, indeed, a much greater risk of being the victim, since it is notorious that the

most

most skilful, and best prepared plans had long been contrived and settled for our speedy connection with the head quarters of jacobinism.—The Anglo-Gallic revolutionists had besides the advantage of close and immediate neighbourhood. No steep and rugged alps formed a barrier to stop contagion in her rapid journey.—The mere circumstance of priority, or posteriority, of time alters not the certainty of the result. Peace, therefore, with France, at the awful crisis of the commencement of hostilities, must inevitably have plunged us into the horrors we now see preying upon these wretched countries. Let no man talk, then, of the distresses of the war, without seriously considering what our condition must have been if that war had not been undertaken, and strenuously continued, in spite of the ignominious opposition of sedition and cowardice. Events, which are always our instructors, clearly demonstrate that it must have terminated in speedy and utter ruin. If a man were told, that the preservation of his life depended upon the delivery of an insignificant purse, would he not cheerfully give it, and smile at the sacrifice? Evil and good are comparative terms:—What was an advantage to

Xenophon,

Xenophon, in his memorable retreat from the battle of Cunaxa, would have been an irrecoverable evil to Miltiades upon the plains of Marathon. The trifling hardships, produced by the war, dwindle into insignificance when compared to the calamities of a subversion of our constitution; and a trade flourishing in an unparalleled degree, is certainly preferable to the annihilation of all commerce. Thus is refuted the unfounded charge of distress.

When I hear it confidently asserted, that the war has been disgraceful, I naturally cast a retrospective glance at its origin, and have the heartfelt satisfaction to find, that it has *hitherto* answered the fullest expectation. It has *hitherto* saved us from the destruction of French principles. It has *hitherto* shielded us from the ruin which neighbouring deluded countries have fatally experienced. It has *hitherto* protected us from the jaws of that devouring monster, which has shewn itself to be the "common enemy and fury of mankind."\* It has, besides, reduced to a skeleton the once formidable maritime force of our

\* The description of the tyrant Nero, by Pliny the Younger. — What was an advantage to our enemies.



enemies. It has thrown into our lap the whole wealth of the West Indies. These acquisitions are intrinsically so precious, and so estimable from the pungent distress which they cause to their late possessors, that it is almost unnecessary to mention Minorca, and those invaluable jewels, the Cape of Good Hope and the island of Ceylon. But ABOVE ALL, it has afforded us an opportunity of observing the *causes* of the ruin of other nations, and the *means* of averting our own. I may be told, perhaps, that we have lost the friendship of once powerful allies. This is an allegation I disdain to deny. It were contemptible and vicious affectation to attempt it. The cause that I defend scorns the aid of lies. “ Je  
 “ n’ai pas l’esprit, ce me semble, assez gâté par la  
 “ contagion controversiste, pour *faire le fer sur*  
 “ cette objection, et pour la traiter d’un air dé-  
 “ daigneux, et méprisant, comme l’on fait d’or-  
 “ dinaire, lorsqu’on se sent incapable de bien  
 “ répondre.”\*

But I would presume to ask,—Can this loss, be ascribed to any fault on our part? Can a vir-

\* *Commentaire Philosophique, &c. de Mr Bayle, 2de. partie, ch. iv.*

tuous man be blamed for the treacherous defection of his friends? But let their miseries soften our asperity into forgiveness and compassion. Their perfidious defection is, indeed, amply punished by their present calamitous sufferings. The noble independence they so lately possessed is now no more. It is gone, I fear, for ever. Light lie the earth on the ashes of the politically dead! Charity implores us to leave them—

—To Heaven

And to those thorns which in their bosoms grow

To sting and vex them.

But notwithstanding the important conquests we have made; I must still frankly confess, that a war like the present is not, altogether, to be estimated by a geographical acquisition, since it did not originate in that design. The chief consideration is, whether it has, or has not, *hitherto* defended us from those principles which unerring experience has proved to be inseparable from the slavery and ruin of every empire?—A question which candour and truth will joyfully answer in the affirmative.

To censure the present war because it has not, *as yet*, completely annihilated the object of its  
 SECTION  
 enmity,

enmity, would be equally irrational as to scandalize a physician, after having overcome a difficult and dangerous disorder, because he could not insure to his patient exemption from mortality. The medicine which experience has shewn to be propitious to health, may be fairly presumed, if carefully continued, to be adequate to the extinction of the disease. The success, however, of a remedy greatly depends on the prudence of the invalid. It is our interest, therefore, to continue this salutary panacea. The value of our escape from the disorders we behold ravaging deluded countries, is inexprebly and immeasurably enhanced from the reflection, that the demolition of a well-framed polity, and of a sound system of morals, is a calamity from which it is not easy, if even possible, to recover. Thus inapplicable, then, to the present war are the stigmatizing accusations of distress and disgrace; and thus false and execrable is that senseless yell which has been so triumphantly founded by malignant disaffection, and echoed by deluded ignorance, to crush indispensable active energy, and to palsy the nerves of confidence and hope.

## SECTION



## SECTION III.

ATTEMPTS AT NEGOTIATION FRUSTRATED BY  
FRANCE.

**WE** are now conducted, by the nature of our vindication, to observe the mutual conduct of Great Britain and France, upon an affair well calculated to exhibit their most secret dispositions—negotiation for the re-establishment of general peace. Upon the examination of this important subject depends the question of propriety, with regard to its past continuance, and future prosecution. To that country, whose inveterate rancour would not permit her to listen to the soothing voice of peace, must the awful responsibility of future bloodshed be necessarily ascribed. Whether it was the interest of Great Britain to abstain from all attempts at conciliation with France, is a consideration indifferent to our present question. Our province, at this instant, is not to speculate upon probabilities, but to narrate and comment upon notorious facts. It will not be denied, that a desire to re-

establish

establish national tranquillity can have proceeded solely from an abhorrence of war.

I find, however, that considerable blame is attached to this country, by the detractors of the justice of the war, on account of her not having manifested a desire to court the smiles of peace, at a moment, which, according to them, was peculiarly favourable. The time to which I allude is that when, as we are informed by Mr. Erskine, "all the Austrian Netherlands had been reduced under the government of the Emperor, and Holland had been delivered from an impending invasion." "Under these circumstances," he continues, "so favourable for negotiation, so critical for terminating the war on terms advantageous to England and her allies, (if it had proceeded upon any rational intelligible foundation) not only no motion was made towards an amicable arrangement, but a principle of hostilities was thus developed which wholly and absolutely precluded the return of peace."\*

The principle of hostilities openly developed, to which he refers, is contained in an extract from

from his Majesty's speech of the 21st January, 1794.

“ To oppose that wild and destructive system  
 “ of rapine, anarchy, impiety and irreligion, the  
 “ effects of which, as they had been manifested  
 “ in France, furnished a dreadful but useful  
 “ lesson to the present age and posterity.”

And the comment he bestows upon it is not unworthy of notice; “ This declaration of Ministers, as declared in the King's speech, was the more striking and extraordinary, as it directly *refuted* their own unfounded assertion that the war had proceeded from France.”

In attempting to justify the conduct of Great Britain upon this occasion, I must commence by giving it as my opinion, that it *was entirely owing* to our conviction, “ that the war had proceeded upon a rational and intelligible foundation,” that we did not solicit the friendship of France. We recollected, that the war originated from the unwarrantable aggression of France upon our ally (Holland) from the desperate, wicked attempts to overthrow our well-



poised Government, and to produce all the terrors of anarchy and atheism. We considered, that although the fate of war had turned the tide of events, and had, for a short time, smiled upon the Germans and the Dutch, yet that the evil mind remained, and although disabled for a moment, was panting for renovation of strength, and was only lurking for an advantageous opportunity to repeat the attack. We reflected, that, although the Austrian Netherlands had been recovered by their rightful Sovereign, and although the usurpers had been driven out of Holland, still these momentary successes were the transient fluctuations of war, that perhaps in a day they might vanish, and that the spirit of rapine in France was rancorous and systematic as ever. We flattered ourselves too with the hope, that this might be a favourable moment to exert our strength for the destruction of the anarchy in France, which threatened with ruin the whole civilized world, at a time when it seemed gasping for breath; and to establish what we were convinced could alone restore happiness to France—a moderate system of monarchy.— We recollected, that we had entered into treaties with the Emperor of Germany, in order  
more

more effectually to destroy the common enemy, which could not be violated either in honour or safety. We reflected besides, that, as France was the aggressor in the contest, it was her part, had she been amicably inclined, to sue for peace; that had she, on the contrary, been determined still to indulge her acrimonious spirit, a solicitation for peace, on our part, would have been attended solely with disappointment and degradation. All these considerations combined to make us consider this epoch, so far from being "critical" for terminating the war on terms advantageous "to England and her allies," the most critical period for its strenuous continuation, as affording greatest hopes of success, in crushing the parent of desolation and revolt: and to impress us with the conviction, that a negotiation for peace, at that moment, would have been a short-sighted policy, for which we should, long before this time, have been severely punished.

I am, I confess, totally at a loss to discover by what rule either of reason or of logic Mr. Erskine can twist the declaration of Ministers (to oppose that wild destructive system, &c.) into

a complete refutation of their own former assertion (which he is pleased to style *unfounded*, but which all his talents and genius have been unable to prove) “ that the war had proceeded “ from France;” since Mr. Erskine must know, all Europe knows, that the war arose from a spirit of desperate aggrandisement and licentious violence on the part of France, in that very system, still formidable, though labouring under a momentary depression, which they had now pledged themselves to oppose; “ a system of “ anarchy, impiety and irreligion, the effects of “ which, as they had been manifested in France, “ furnished a dreadful but useful lesson to the “ present age and to posterity.”

So far then from being culpable, for not bowing the knee to an usurping enemy, at a time when it appeared weakened by the struggle, our conduct was highly laudable, and truly prudent, and shews, beyond all dubitation, that the only measure we had to adopt was to continue the war with vigor, till an opportunity should offer itself likely to produce a peace, upon permanent and honorable terms.

This



This declaration, so far from tending to *refute* their former assertion—that the war sprung from the aggression of France, was merely a repetition (though a repetition sanctioned and strengthened by experience) of their primitive and unalterable sentiments; and can be no more said to invalidate them, than my expressing my conviction, possibly six months hence, that Mr. Erskine's ideas respecting the origin of the war are grounded in error, can be construed into a confutation of my present opinion.

The war was, consequently, prosecuted with that energy, the situation of the country so peculiarly demanded. It was not long, however, before we were consoled by the cheerful intelligence that our prospect appeared to be more exhilarating from the circumstance of the anarchy in France being materially diminished.

His Majesty graciously informed us, in his speech of 29th October, 1795, “ that it was a  
 “ great satisfaction to him to reflect, that not-  
 “ withstanding the many events unfavourable to  
 “ the common cause, the prospect resulting from  
 “ the general situation of affairs had, in many  
 M 3 “ respects,

“ respects, been materially improved in the  
 “ course of the present year.”

I shall not abuse the patience of my readers, or waste my own time, by enumerating the puerile sneers which faction naturally let loose to vilify a communication so peculiarly calculated to diffuse general joy : nor shall I descend to notice animadversions which are so deficient, not only in ingenuity, but even in common-sense, as to render the refutation of them an inglorious enterprize.

Such, indeed, were the sentiments of humanity which directed the Royal conduct, that, after permitting a short time to elapse, in order to experience the stability of the new Constitution of France, unmindful of the discouraging difficulties which he had to encounter, the King followed up, with a prudent alacrity, that disposition for peace, of which he had lately made so unambiguous an assurance.

His Majesty directed his Minister in Switzerland, to make, in his name, an overture to the  
 French

French Government, in order to ascertain their disposition upon the subject of peace.

Mr. Wickham, consequently, in his note to M. Barthélemy, requested to know, whether France was willing to open a negotiation with his Britannic Majesty and his allies, for the re-establishment of a general peace, upon just and suitable conditions, by sending members for this purpose to a general Congress?

Whether they were willing to specify the general basis of a pacification which France would wish to propose; in order that his Majesty might examine, in concert with his allies, whether it was of such a nature, as could possibly serve for the foundation of a general pacific negotiation? Lastly, in case *this* mode of procedure should be objected to; whether they would point out any *other way*, calculated to attain the same end—General Peace?

This invitation, calculated, one would have supposed, to soothe the jarring and fiery tempers of the French Ministry, was answered in a strain of the most insulting and inconsistent



ostentation. M. Barthélemi's answer, *professed* an ardent desire, on the part of the Directory, to procure for the Republic a just, honorable, and solid peace : It affected to doubt the reality of our professions, and the reasons upon which it grounded this injurious scepticism, arose merely from the circumstance of *this* Minister not having been authorized to enter *instantly* into the negotiation.\*—Was ever before seen so capacious, and contemptible a plea ? So, according to the ratiocination of this diplomatic casuist,—because his Majesty had not set his workmen about raising the superstructure, before he had enquired whether the foundation had been dug, and whether it was sure and stable, it followed, as a necessary consequence, that the wish and design of the Royal Architect never existed, and that his enquiries were mere illusions. It lavished the most unmerited objections upon the pro-

\* “ La démarche de M. Wickham lui eût causé une véritable satisfaction, si la déclaration même que ce Ministre fait, de n'avoir aucun mandat, aucun pouvoir, pour négocier, ne donnait lieu de douter de la sincérité des intentions pacifiques de sa cour.”—Note de M. Barthélemi. It is not to be imagined, that this able Minister spoke the genuine sentiments of his own mind. He was too long the mere tool of his capricious tyrants.

posed mode—General Congress, (which has so often restored strength to exhausted Europe,) because it necessarily requires some time, to settle the complicated interests, and to separate and establish the mingled and confused rights of warring nations. But it took special care to pass over in silence, his Majesty's wish to know what *other mode* they would prefer. The solution of this plain question must have exacted a plain answer,—and consequently would have infringed upon their adopted rules, and have frustrated their talent for evasion.

It had, however, the candor to announce a principle which they were confident was totally inadmissible ;—a principle specifically declared to be indispensable to negotiation : viz. An avowed determination to retain all the territories which France, in the wild impulse of intoxicating success, had madly annexed to her Constitution, which was to be realized, by retaining all the conquests she had made upon other powers, and by having a complete restoration of all she had lost in the contest,

A desire;

A desire, in itself so insane, and in its nature so fatal, could not generate any other effect than contempt and refusal. Mr. Erskine, however, attempts indirectly to defend this extravagant conduct, by “denying that the best step, or that any just or rational step, was taken by Ministers on Mr. Wickham’s propositions towards peace,” asserting, “that it was impossible that France should not actually entertain that suspicion of our sincerity:”—This argument he strengthens by the very identical reason alleged by the French Directory, as a proof of our illusive and evasive conduct, “that Mr. Wickham had no diplomatic character conferred upon him for the purpose of negotiation, he was only Minister to the Swiss Cantons.” Was it necessary, I ask, that his Majesty should appoint a Minister to enter into a negotiation before he knew whether they were peacefully inclined, and whether they would condescend to accept him? By what means his Majesty could attain that knowledge, without making the application to the French Government, I have not sagacity enough to discover. Could not that application be made by a Minister



nister unempowered to act any other part than as the channel through whom the application was to be made, and the answer returned?— Did it necessarily follow then, as a necessary consequence, that because the Minister had no other authority than that of *making* the inquiry—the application itself was delusive and invalid? If I have an extreme desire to perform a journey, and am ignorant of the direct road, does it necessarily follow, that, because I should request a friend to enquire of a traveller *that* road, or any *other* which may lead to my proposed place of destination; I have no *real wish* to undertake that journey, and that my enquiries are fallacious and futile, and are only meant to insult the person from whom I request the information? Such an absurd conclusion would certainly be disgraceful to his understanding. How did the Directory know that it might not be his Majesty's intentions, to send some *other* Minister to treat with them for peace? and how was this to be effected till his Majesty knew whether they would receive him? And was this knowledge to be gained without making the necessary inquiries? Was his Majesty to run the risk of dispatching a Minister to

to Paris, who might possibly, (as in the case of Mr. Bird sent to state the real situation of the Duc de Choiseul,) be received, upon his arrival, by some "theatrical figure of the Opera, with a "head shaded by three coloured plumes," and obligingly delivered into the custody of a ferocious Sans Culotte guard, with strict orders to hunt him out of their territories? Thus it must appear that the accusations against our conduct are frivolous and absurd. With respect to the proposed mode of pacification—a Congress—let us admit the truth of their fallacious assertions,—that a Congress must naturally make the negotiation interminable; What does it prove? —That their enlightened wisdom, which could discover imbecillity in a measure so frequently resorted to by the powers of Europe, should suggest some mode more adequate and expeditious, particularly as we expressly left it to their choice. But what opinion shall we form of the judgment of these sapient Archons, when we recollect, that the mode of pacification, which they so pointedly stigmatize, is declared by the \* Law of Nations, (and what is infinitely greater) by that unerring oracle experience, the most

\* Vide Vattel, Book iv, chap. 2d.

competent and favorable to restore to Europe the blessings of peace? They forgot surely those at Ryfwick, Utrecht, and Aix la Chapelle. Was it just then to besmear with the opprobrious charge of perfidy, a nation which proposed this salutary and approved measure, and which even resigned the choice of another to the free and uncontrouled discretion of the enèmy? These reflections must prove to the plainest understanding, the ridiculous and shallow reasons, assigned by the Directory in support of their indefensible conduct. Let us now advert to the principle which France assured us was the only one, upon which she would consent to receive (what she called) just and reasonable overtures, and which she announced to be conformable to the dignity of the Republic.

This principle professed itself sprung from the new-born Constitution of France, and arrogated to itself the exclusive power of superseding and annulling the treaties which mutually bind the several States of Europe. It virtually issued a proclamation, that every other power must willingly resign its choicest possessions and dearest interests; that every other power must cheerfully

consent



consent that it should swallow up in its insatiate gulf all their conquered domains : and that it should instantly recover all the territories which it might have lost in the course of the fluctuating contest. It modestly informed them, that these sacrifices were merely the indispensable *preliminary* to the *discussion* of the treaty, as the *price* she exacted for the *privilege* of pacification, and were only preparatory to the surrender of their remaining possessions. As this demand could not possibly be realized, it could only be brought forward for the purpose of insulting Great Britain, since it required her to strip herself of her vast and valuable possessions, and quietly to submit to abject degradation and grinding poverty in order to suit the caprice of a wild and insatiable despot. Even this tyrannical principle materially invalidated the force of their former calumny, that the conduct of Great Britain was full of insincerity and perfidy; for, had it been insincere and perfidious, it would certainly have been consonant to the dignity of the Grande Nation, to look down upon it with silent scorn, and with the contempt always due to the disciples of Jason, from the lofty and commanding throne of manly candour :—

Had



*pacific intentions?* And what could possibly induce Great Britain to be *insincere* in a measure which appears to be her *true interest?*

This is a paradox, which I have derived from M. Barthélémi's note, the solution of which I must leave to some more skilful logician. I frankly confess my slender knowledge of dialectics renders me totally inadequate to the task.

This conduct on the part of the French Directory strikingly indicated a firm determination to continue the calamities of war, and to permit no principles of equity or reason to interfere in the prosecution of their bloody career. Their charges against this country, are weak and unfounded. With them, an unequivocal assurance of a pacific disposition is considered as a mark of insincerity; and an ingenuous invitation to point out a channel clearer than that which their caprice may choose to choak up with thorns, is infallibly the criterion of punic perfidy. It is clear, however, that no negotiation could possibly be established: since, although  
they



they had taken the liberty to spurn at the mode proposed by his Majesty, they had not condescended to point out any other which might be more adequate to the important object in view.

Such, then, being the avowed barefaced tyranny of France, it is obvious, that as long as she continued to intrench herself in such inadmissible though paltry principles, his Majesty had no alternative but to prosecute the war.

But notwithstanding the notoriousness of their most uncivilized conduct, the Directory had the vile effrontery to proclaim to their injured country, that they had anxiously offered the most equitable terms to Great Britain in the hope of terminating hostilities, but that she had treated them with the most insulting contempt—and that consequently to her alone was to be attributed the prolongation of the war.

In order, therefore, to expose so palpable a falsehood, and to destroy every possibility of subterfuge, his Majesty, animated by that love of peace, which has invariably guided his conduct,

N

duct,

duct, determined, notwithstanding his recent disappointment and the discouraging difficulties which presented themselves, to renew in another form, and through the intervention of a friendly power, a proposal to negotiate for the re-establishment of peace.

His Majesty made application through the medium of his Danish Majesty's Minister at Paris, for a passport for a person of confidence, who would be invested with the power of discussing, with the Executive Directory, the most proper means of producing a general peace. This mild and conciliatory desire was received with the most cold and malignant indifference. They suffered a considerable time to elapse, before they even deigned to inform us, that they rejected our overtures, transmitted through this channel. It was not to be expected that they would condescend to signify the cause of their objections. They forget, however, their dignity so far as to intimate, that if persons were sent furnished with full powers, and official papers, these might upon the frontiers, demand the passports necessary for proceeding to Paris. But although these circumstances were but too in-

dicative

indicative of the hostile temper of the French Government, yet as his Majesty had the strongest reasons to suppose that, owing to the innumerable calamities and unspeakable distresses produced by the war, the majority of the French nation fervently deprecated its continuance, and panted for the hour of healing peace, he resolved that his humane intentions should not be blasted by the wily designs of her sanguinary tyrants. His Majesty, therefore, directed a fresh overture to be made in his name. Upon which the Directory, finding it no longer possible to persist in the absolute rejection of them, and seeing that the smallest pretext for eluding discussion was, by this step, annihilated, at length found themselves driven to the necessity of indicating a channel, through which they professed themselves willing to commence a negotiation, and to receive a Minister empowered by his Majesty to enter upon the grand work of pacification.

His Majesty consequently directed Lord Malmesbury to proceed instantly to Paris.—A Nobleman from whose acknowledged talents and high diplomatic character the greatest hopes of success were naturally entertained. His Lord-



ship, upon his arrival at Paris, and after the necessary exchange of respective powers, delivered a memorial, which wisely proposed the immediate establishment of a general principle to serve as a basis, for the definitive arrangements.

This principle, founded in generosity and justice, was no other than an "offer to make compensation to France, by proportionable restitutions, for those arrangements to which she would be called upon to assent, in order to satisfy the just demands of the King's allies, and to preserve the political balance of Europe."

The memorial stated, that, as soon as the principle should be acknowledged, "His Majesty would explain himself more particularly on the application of this principle to the different objects which might be discussed between the respective parties."

But even this memorial, which breathed the most unequivocal wishes for universal peace, and which was so peculiarly calculated to procure it

it to the belligerent powers, was not answered with an expedition due to its importance. A considerable time was permitted to elapse before an answer was returned to it. The French Directory at length found themselves under the necessity of transmitting an answer; but couched in the most offensive and injurious terms. It affected to doubt the sincerity of those dispositions of which his Majesty had given so unambiguous a proof—It had the audacity to suppose that his Majesty would betray the interests of his allies, to whom he was bound by the most solemn treaties, and that he would exclude them from the advantages of the proposed pacification. It had, however, the puny cunning to omit a declaration either of recognition or refusal of the proposed principle.

But although this paltry and evasive conduct was perfectly congenial to the nature of the Directory of usurpers, still, as it was obviously devised for the purpose of obstructing the progress of the discussion, his Lordship, without descending to refute the false and opprobrious imputations (which were, indeed, far beneath the notice of his Majesty) confined himself to

the explicit demand of a frank and precise declaration, either as to the acceptance of this principle, or as to the changes or modifications which they might desire to have made in it, or whether, in fine, they proposed any other principle to answer the same end.

His Lordship likewise assured them, "That  
 "his Majesty would omit nothing on his part,  
 "as well to dispose his august allies to concur in  
 "the negotiation, by the means the most proper to facilitate its progress, as to induce them  
 "to persevere in those pacific sentiments, of  
 "which his Majesty the Emperor and King,  
 "gave to the Government of France, so striking  
 "a proof at the opening of the campaign."—  
 Sentiments which were so consonant to his Majesty's wishes, and so essential to the re-establishment of a general peace upon just, honourable and permanent conditions.

The French Government, after the most tedious delay and most puerile evasions, at length agreed to establish the principle proposed by his Majesty, as the basis of the negotiation; memorials were consequently presented by the

King's



King's Minister at their express desire, containing the outlines of the terms of peace. These papers "were accompanied by a declaration, expressly and repeatedly made, both verbally and in writing, that his Majesty's Minister was willing and prepared to enter into the discussion of the different points there contained, or into that of any other proposal or scheme of peace which the French Government might wish to substitute in its place."

The manner in which they received the first memorial will for ever brand with infamy their character for negotiation.—This memorial principally related to the restitutions to the Emperor and King of all his dominions, on the footing of the status ante bellum: which restitutions, on the part of France, were to be compensated by the entire and unreserved restoration of *all* the conquests which his Britannic Majesty had made upon her in the East and West Indies.

A proposal so equitable in itself, and so creditable to the generosity of his Majesty, was scornfully rejected, as a direct interference with the new-fangled and enigmatical Constitution of

France. They gave us to understand that the Emperor could not flatter himself with the hopes of recovering his possessions, lost by the casualty of the war, merely from their having taken the liberty to annex them to their Constitution; and that they could not be disposed of without flinging the nation into all the confusion which must follow a convocation of the primary assemblies.

This preposterous doctrine being naturally combated by Lord Malmesbury, as being incompatible with every rule of equity and justice, and inimical to the grand object in view, was immediately followed by a peremptory desire to deliver to them, at the very outset of the business, a statement of the final terms to which his Court would in any case accede. As his Lordship was yet ignorant, whether they had accepted his first proposal, since they had not yet acknowledged it, nor informed him of the nature or extent of their objections to it, much less received from them any other offer or plan of peace, he could not possibly reply to a desire so extravagant in its nature, and so impracticable in its execution, in any other manner than by a firm but mild refusal.

refusal.—It was a demand which directly tended to shut the door to all negotiation, by totally destroying every possibility of adjusting the points of contention. After his Lordship had assigned the reasons which rendered this request totally inadmissible, and had, at the same time, renewed his former declarations of readiness to enter into the discussion of the proposal which he had conveyed, or of any other which they might think proper to communicate to him, he received no other answer than an abrupt order to quit Paris in forty-eight hours.

A conduct on their part so stained with barbarous indecency, clearly demonstrated, that, at no period, was the termination of the war desired by France. But forgetting, for a moment, their ferocity, let us advert to the causes which they assigned as rendering our wishes impracticable. It was insisted upon, it appears, by the Directory, that all the\* territories, which, antecedently to the war, might have belonged to the different belligerent powers, were, from their being annexed to the constitution of France

\* This is the same claim that M. Barthélemy brought forward in his note, dated March 8th.

subsequently



subsequently to it, rendered for ever irrecoverable to their rightful owners.

Was ever before seen so inconsistent a despotism? With what justice could France arrogate to herself the right of disposing of the territory of her enemies, which had fallen into her hands only by the chance of fluctuating war. All Europe was not, surely, to be guided by her despotic will. Europe was not certainly to be bound by a law which tore her in atoms, merely because that law enriched France.—Has any state an exclusive right of setting up in its dominions a droit public, which is to level with the ground the droit public of Europe, acknowledged as such by all the members (excepting that particular State) of the great commonwealth of Europe? No other sentiment, then, but that of outrageous madness could possibly suggest the creation of a law, which was in its nature hostile to the very existence of other countries, and which, it consequently could not be expected, that other countries would acknowledge. Had they the exclusive power to annul all treaties which bound Europe, and which are known to be necessary to her safety and independence?

pendence? As they knew that those treaties were in force previously to the enactment of their new code of laws, what reason had they to suppose that those treaties would give precedence to this infant tyrant? Has any power in Europe a just right to separate herself from the acknowledged laws by which the States of Europe are leagued together, and to raise up an arbitrary code of her own; and to exact, besides, that Europe should abrogate her ancient laws, and abide by this particular one, at the same time that it is known to the European commonwealth to be hostile to her interests and dangerous to her existence? The august college of the ancient European States was not to be governed by the despotic mandates of the professors of anarchy and revolt, nor were we to be reconciled to their barbarous whim, by the assurance, that, as an unalterable declaration was made, at the framing of this constitution, that every atom which it then possessed was for ever unalienable, we should acquiesce in it, as a trifling inconvenience, and chearfully submit to the ruinous degradation. According to their mode of reasoning, had they conquered Ireland, or, in fact, any other valuable part of this

this empire, that possession would become instantly an integral part of France, and would be, ever after, irrecoverable by Great Britain; and by no means subject to the principle of reciprocity of cession. This, we are told, arises from the clause which prohibits abdication without passing through the prolix ordeal of the primary assemblies; and which, even if agreed to, must necessarily employ a space of nine years.\*

If  
 \* I aver that the asserted incompatibility of the Directory to enter into a negotiation, owing to alleged barriers which bounded its intentions, is contradicted by the Constitution itself." "The Directory only," says the Constitution—Titre 12, Relations Extérieures, Art. 329, "can hold political correspondence with the exterior, conduct negotiation," &c. Again, art. 330, "It is authorized to make preliminary stipulations," &c.—Again, art. 331 particularly affirms, "that the Executive Directory decides, signs, or causes to be signed, with Foreign Powers, all Treaties of Peace, and other contracts which it may judge necessary for the good of the State."—And art. 333 expressly announces in the most unequivocal terms, that although "Treaties are only valid when they have been examined and ratified by the Legislative Body: nevertheless, the secret conditions may receive provisionally their execution from the moment they are agreed to by the Directory." Now, I would be glad to be informed, how these exclusive privileges of the Directory could be acted upon, without it had the necessary powers, and how these powers could be employed and guided, except by the judgment and skill of their exclusive possessors—the Directory, (accountable, no doubt, in this



If the mere annexation of territory to the constitution constitutes individual possession, had they, in the course of the war, lost Calais or Brest, or any other valuable member which was annexed to their constitution at its inauguration, that conquest must have been restored, merely as a satisfaction to the constitutional law; in that light only was it to be judged:—not as an object of proportionate compensation, but as a trifling restitution simply to humour the caprice of this new-born code—a code born of violence and rapacity, at whose awful birth were instantly offered up as victims the dearest possessions of neighbouring States.—It must be granted, however, that, if it was required by France that we should pay the most implicit obedience to the commands of this law, it should, at least, have been clear and illuminative, to enable us to avoid the rocks of doubt and error. It should have been written in such unequivocal language as in all other cases, to the Legislative Body,) when it should find it necessary “*au bien de l’état.*” I would likewise ask, which is most entitled to credit, the voice of the Constitution, which assigns to it these powers, and which, for its sanctity and truth, they held up for the reverence and imitation of all mankind, or these mere assertions unsupported by the testimony of the Constitution and indeed virtually denied by it?

as before—the Directory, (accountable, no doubt, in this

as to set at defiance all possibility of mistake. No man can obey a law without properly understanding what that law enacts, and that indubitable perspicuity is, doubtless, rendered necessary in proportion to its importance; every law, therefore, which affects the prosperity, happiness, and existence of a man, should be written in letters of so clear a magnitude, that equivocations or misapprehensions could have no opportunity to arise. Was this the case with respect to the law which scattered the dominions of Europe, and drove them into the grasp of avaricious France? So far from being clear and explicit, I aver, that no man will be willing to hazard the declaration, that there is one single word to be seen concerning the *Austrian Netherlands* in the whole *immaculate* Gallican decretal: so that we may fairly deny its existence.—It is not, however, difficult to trace this paradox to its source. No man will surely suffer himself to be the dupe of this shallow artifice, and suppose that the French Directory *really* felt themselves bound by the voice of this Constitution, and could not possibly but obey its mandates. The opinion cannot, for an instant, be entertained, that the present rulers would pay these posthumous and pious

pious honors to the deceased builders of a fabric,  
 within whose narrow walls they were doomed to  
 be confined. It will not be believed, that they  
 would pay implicit obedience to a law, which  
 laid down commands without providing for pro-  
 bable casualty, or distant contingency; which  
 bound them to its despotic mandates amidst  
 the innumerable fluctuations of war. No man  
 will betray the weakness to affirm, that the  
 reigning bench of Despots paid this solemn tri-  
 bute of respect to the manes of a departed and  
 annihilated Government, which bequeathed to  
 them at its decease a code of laws, indissoluble  
 in their nature, and unalterably the same, amidst  
 the advantages of victory or disasters of defeat.  
 It was not possible for these men to guide the  
 helm of France, without possessing the inherent  
 and personal power of making peace consistent  
 with the accidental situation in which she might  
 then be, and suitable to her existing interests.  
 They would not, therefore, suffer themselves to  
 be controuled by a law, which, as it directed  
 the same course to be observed whether in peace  
 or war, necessarily precluded them from the op-  
 portunity of making, by mutual cession, pro-  
 bably an advantageous peace: which inevitably  
 bound



bound them to the horrors of a nine years war unless implicit obedience should be paid by the European powers to its wanton and sanguinary caprice. To harbour a contrary opinion would disgrace even the common sense of a Samojede. Credat, who chuses, certainly not Indus Apella.

The solution of this problem is, however, no tremendous labour. The Directory of France, conscious that the duration of their self created power was co-extensive with the war, and convinced of the ardent desire for peace which reigned in the hearts of the people, resolved at once to impose upon their credulity, and secure to themselves a continuance of their usurped autocracy. They proclaimed, therefore, to their deluded and oppressed countrymen, that the laws which formed the boundary of their dominion were indissoluble—that no mortal force could annul them without passing through the lingering torment of a nine years trial. Solemn assurances were, at the same time, artfully made, that the honor and interests of the Republic required that the laws should remain in undiminished force. The lamentable effects of this

blind

blind acquiescence, on the part of the French nation, was felt by France herself, and by all Europe. It nourished the insatiate spirit of rapacity which has ever stimulated her upstart despots, and afforded them an opportunity of preserving their authority by a flagrant imposition upon the credulity of their own nation, and by a most flagrant and abandoned effrontery towards all others. Confident that the only means of frustrating the peaceful intentions of his Majesty, and of counteracting the skill and equity of his Minister, was to make a demand of a nature incompatible with compliance, they discovered that the peremptory exaction of an ultimatum, would answer all their purposes, and amply realize their utmost wishes. An ultimatum was, consequently, required to be given in, stating the final terms to which Great Britain would be willing to accede.—A demand which, as they had not signified to what points in the memorial they had any objections, and what concessions they were willing to make in return;—as it entirely destroyed every means of explanation, and consequently annihilated all possibility of settling the points in dispute; as it tended to lay bare all the sacrifices we were

O

willing

willing to make for the return of peace, without affording us any information of the intended cessions on their part, could not in the nature of things be complied with. Cogent and equitable reasons accompanied this refusal: but they had not the magic power to deprive the Directory of this glorious opportunity of triumphing in the success of their diabolical scheme. They instantly sent a most insulting order to his Majesty's Minister to quit the territories of France. And, indeed, had any thing been wanting to complete the measure of their insolent conduct, it had been found in the note which conveyed this abrupt and insolent mandate.—His Lordship is there informed, that because he would not instantly accede to demands of a nature so unprecedented and unexpected, that they could not have been speculated by the wildest visionary, before he had the necessary authority, and which was solely derivable from his Court: that because he would not make a public display of all our intended cessions, without even a promise of a peep at their's, he was not a man after their own hearts, and gave them no hopes of becoming the dupe to their shallow and villainous artifice.—They added a sneer, that

couriers



couriers would be equally capable of discharging the difficulties of negotiation. In justice to genius, it must be confessed that they have acquired credit for the novelty of the discovery, that to the conduct of those arduous and intricate affairs, to which plenipotentiaries may, hereafter, be found inadequate, couriers may be supposed to be fully competent.

It may not, perhaps, be unworthy of remark, that the French Minister (De la Croix) did so far commit himself as to confess, that a recompense for the surrender of the Austrian Netherlands, on the part of the Emperor, might be easily found by the robbery of the neighbouring States: but as such predatory views could be cherished only by powers possessing the same vicious principles, they naturally met with an immediate repulse.

This thesis has been so often, and so ably discussed, that it seems unnecessary to enter into a more minute detail of the inconsistent and tyrannical conduct of France. I cannot, however, refrain from expressing my surprise at the attempt of Mr. Erskine, to defend the behavi-

our of our enemy, and to prove our misconduct in this most important negotiation. He commences by telling us, "that the difficulty of getting France to agree to the basis of mutual compensation," (a principle founded in reason and justice,) "was a dispute about nothing."\* I cannot discern by what rule of reason a desire to settle, as the basis of a negotiation, some general and acknowledged principle upon which to act, some foundation, without which, in fact, no fabric could possibly be raised, and which became peculiarly essential to be clearly and firmly fixed, from their wavering and unsettled conduct in first retarding its recognition by studied delay — and afterwards in agreeing to it with an involuntary and inauspicious spirit, can justly be called "a dispute about nothing."

I perceive, besides, that Mr. Erskine cannot overcome his old doubts of the sincerity of his Majesty's wishes for peace, and that his opinion of their insincerity is strengthened by his conviction that our Ambassador was not entrusted

with even a single term. If peace, or the instant alternative between peace and war," he says, "had been the *serious* object of this Embassy, was not a man of the Ambassador's high dignity and great capacity, to be trusted with even a single term which constituted the *quæ non* of his embassy?" To affirm that Lord Malmesbury was not in possession of terms, from the mere circumstance of his not having enumerated them, is, indeed, to fly for assistance to the most paltry and illiberal arts of sophistry. It is to draw conclusions without having established premises. He would, indeed, be an unskilful, as well as an uncandid logician, who should pronounce *ex cathedra*, that a man's refusal to impart a secret necessarily proved that he never possessed one. Had the British Ambassador been in possession of ten thousand, he was prevented from declaring one of them, by an abrupt demand which abolished mutual disclosure, and which immediately followed their virtual disavowal of the principle of reciprocal compensation. To have obeyed this demand would have been to betray the interests of his country. His conduct would have been highly criminal; as such an exposure must



have degraded his country, by delivering her into the hands of a rapacious foe, and consequently must have been directly hostile to every possibility of successful negotiation. It is obvious then, that what was meant as a taunting censure is actually a compliment to his patriotic sagacity.

If Mr. Erskine grounds his opinion of his non-possession of a single term from the circumstance of his expressed inability to deliver instantly an ultimatum, it may be replied, that, although the British Ambassador was, doubtless in possession of an ultimatum, still that ultimatum was then totally useless, since the principle of mutual compensation, upon which it could solely be founded, was then disdained. He was consequently under the necessity of applying for another. It will not surely be argued, that he should have been furnished with a cargo of ultimatums, some one of which must have quadrated exactly with the whimsical schemes and ephemeral resolves of his prévaricating antagonist. It will not be ignorantly thought, that the intricate and elaborate operation of guarding the individual interests, of combining

the

the various pretensions of each belligerent power, and of specifying, in one systematic view, the final statement of the terms of peace; it will not be thought, I say, that this herculean labour, which can be achieved solely by means of mutually acknowledged principles, is a little peddling bargain which can be settled by adding or diminishing an ounce in the balance.

Candour will grant, however, that his anxious desire to send to his Court their demand, his readiness, expressed at the delivery of his answer, to enter into every explanation which might be required on the contents of his note, added to his voluntary offer to accept any contre-projet from them, were unquestionably most incontestable proofs of his sincere and ardent wish for the restoration of peace, by the only mode that could possibly effect it.

To indulge in guessing the number or nature of the terms with which he was charged, would be, indeed, to squander away our time in barren and idle speculation.

We do not scruple, however, to pronounce, that, as an unequivocal declaration was made regarding the individual interests of combining

that this resignation, on their part, was to be compensated by adequate cessions on the part of his Britannic Majesty, it was fully competent to open the channel of fair and honourable negotiation, had such a desire existed on the part of France: it was certainly as manly and as candid a declaration as ever was offered by a minister at the commencement of a negotiation.

We are next attracted by his labored dissertation to prove, that the war was solely continued for the recovery of Belgium. To assist his argument he states the following case: "Let me suppose she had been willing to cede Belgium, and every territory of any consequence demanded of her, with the exception of some insignificant town or fort, which she had refused upon the footing of an annexation during the war, under her constitution. Let me farther suppose (which is necessary to bring the touchstone to the argument) that it is admitted the thing refused was of no consequence or value to Great Britain.—In such a case, is any man prepared to contend that we ought to continue the war, not for the cession of additional territory, but to beat the

English

" French



"French out of an unfounded reason for refusing what we did not want."

his Britannic Majesty, it was fully competent to

This question is, it must be owned, dexterously planned to entrap, at first sight, the incautious observer. It is, indeed, admirably calculated

ad captandum vulgus.—Certainly not, cries a thundering acclamation from the sanc-

tum sanctorum of the Corresponding Society;

and *therefore* Belgium is the *sole* cause of the

continuance of the war;—which unquestion-

ably proves its impropriety. With every de-

ference, however, to so venerable a judgment,

I must aver that this question is useless. Al-

though we grant that a principle derives im-

portance solely from its effects, and although

we confess that if, in conformity to this vo-

luntary principle, they had seized upon the

huts of the Elquimaux, it would have been to

us but of little moment; still our confessions

do not prove that Belgium was the *sole* cause of

the continuance of hostilities. Such a conclu-

sion, would, indeed, disgrace the sagacity of a

Hottentot. It cannot be denied, that a forced

annexion of foreign territory, whose value to its

cession of additional territory, but to beat the

rightful owner could not be compensated, whose restoration was pronounced impracticable, and for which an equivalent was not even offered, was a virtual and complete disavowal of reciprocal compensation. Unless it can be proved then, that this general principle was *solely* applicable to Belgium, (which is to prove a contradiction) it cannot be inferred that Belgium was the *sole* cause of the prolongation of the war. Because the Belgic provinces were the first topic of discussion, and were included in the general principle which scorned reciprocity of cession, there is no more justice or truth, in declaring that they were the *sole* cause of the prosecution of the war, than there would be in pronouncing an individual barbarian guilty of *all* the cruelties which, in the middle ages, desolated so many countries, *because he happened to belong to the camp of Ghengis Khan.*

Although Belgium was of an enormous value, and although it *might* have been worth the trial to drive France from an unwarrantable usurpation; still it by no means follows, that it was the *sole* reason of the continuance of hostilities. Such a conclusion is not derived

from

from our confession, that it was a collateral, assistant, nay, even principal reason; from the recollection of the danger to which Europe was exposed from the acquisition to France of so vast a track of coast; as also from the sacred obligations of his Majesty's Crown, and the binding force of his Treaties. The *real cause* of its prosecution is known, by all Europe, to have been the uncivilized conduct of France in making a demand solely from the consciousness of the impossibility of complying with it, and consequently favorable to her ardent desire for war; in breaking off the negotiation by disavowing the only basis upon which successful negotiation could ever be built—mutual compensation; and in atrociously terminating it by an \*expulsion

\* I am surprized to find it affirmed, that the dismissal of Lord Malmesbury was equally deserved with that of M. Chauvêlin. The cases are by no means analogous. Ingenuity cannot draw the smallest comparison between them. The French Minister was dismissed from his obstinacy to quit the bone of contention which had been violently wrested from its rightful owner. The British Plenipotentiary was ignominiously expelled for his refusal to subscribe to the degradation and ruin of his country. The conduct of the former was marked by sinister and malicious machinations against the happiness of this country: The conduct of the latter was characterized by an earnest desire to restore to Europe the comforts of Peace.

of



of the British Ambassador.—These are the real reasons which put an end to the negotiation; and so far from his Majesty being principal, it must be owned that he was not even instrumental, in prolonging the miseries of war.

But admitting, for the sake of argument, the truth of Mr. Erskine's assertion, that the war was continued merely for Belgium, (it seems unnecessary to renew our protest against it,) what does it prove?—That his Majesty, religiously faithful to the obligation of his treaties, and to the interests of his august ally, convinced likewise of the lawless spirit of rapine which still reigned in the hearts of the French tyrants, was determined to repel it by force of arms, and thus defend the rights of injured Europe. It should not be forgot, that if his Majesty had felt any wish for personal aggrandizement, he had an ample opportunity of indulging it, since, by the brilliant success of his naval forces, he had made conquests from France and her allies, of an almost incalculable value, and had not himself lost any possession; besides had he been willing to neglect the interests of his allies, he would, doubtless, have received considerable

cessions

cessions as the price of that perfidy. His Majesty, on the contrary, cheerfully offered to resign his own valuable conquests and important acquisitions, to secure the political balance of Europe, and save from further distress an august and virtuous ally;—by generously placing him in the same situation that he enjoyed at the commencement of the war. A conduct, influenced by such noble and virtuous motives, instead of being held out to the censure of all his credulous subjects, by deluding them with the idea that their distresses are continued for the sake of assisting a foreign nation (with which they weakly imagine they have no concern) demands the veneration, and commands the affection of all wise and virtuous men.

It is, therefore, indisputably manifest, that the failure of the sincere and ardent attempts of the King to terminate the calamities of war by a general peace,—a peace founded upon principles which violence and fraud cannot deny to have been framed by justice, however resolved they may be, from the impulse of their nature, to resist them, was solely to be attributed to the wild

wild spirit of rapine which unfortunately still directed the councils of France.

Their demoniack hatred of the salutary blessings of peace, but too plainly evinced at the commencement of the negotiation; their futile objections arising from the consciousness of the justice on which it would have been founded; and their insatiable ambition, and boundless desire of aggrandizement; form a striking and memorable contrast; to the ingenuous offers of amity, to the manly and generous ardour at once demonstrative of sincerity, and favourable to success, and to the heroic and unexampled disinterestedness which characterized the conduct of his Majesty:—a conduct which, in spite of the machinations of faction, will prove an invulnerable shield to protect a Prince who reigns in the hearts of his people.

From these considerations it is manifest, that nothing was left to his Majesty but to prosecute a war which was prolonged solely by the determined perseverance of France in the malignant and destructive views in which it originated. Not long, however, after the abrupt termina-

tion



tion of the negotiation for peace, the progress of the French arms was marked by the most rapid and unexpected success.—The tide of prosperity, which had so lately wafted the Austrians over seas of glory, suddenly turned against them, and left them stranded upon the shoals of adversity and despair.—The Emperor found himself reduced to the necessity of offering proposals for peace, in which his Belgic territories were the victims he was forced to sacrifice at the altar of Regicide, for the preservation of his other dominions.

No sooner had his Majesty learnt that the preliminaries of a peace between Austria and France had been signed, than that warm regard for the happiness of his people, which has ever been the characteristic of his conduct, prompted him to consider that as a favorable opportunity to enquire the disposition of France upon the subject of a general peace; under the conviction, that the cession of the Belgic provinces, on the part of his Imperial Majesty, necessarily must simplify the work of pacification, and had completely removed one of the principal causes which rendered ineffectual the former attempt.

But

But though pride and dignity elevated on their throne of splendid successes, strongly dissuaded his Majesty from taking a step which seemed to them bordering on humiliation, still his heart, in the tenderness of affection for his people, earnestly implored the renewal of an endeavour to restore to them the blessings attendant upon peace.

\* Animated with these views, the King caused a note to be transmitted to the French Directory, expressive of his former and unaltered pacific sentiments, and proposing to enter, in such manner as should be deemed the most expedient, upon the discussion of the pretensions of each party, for the regulation of the preliminaries of a peace which might be definitively arranged at a future Congress.

To this conciliatory conduct, on the part of his Majesty, the Directory retorted in a manner which clearly manifested a perseverance in

\* Upon this recent and notorious subject I shall purposely endeavour to be brief; convinced that the circumstances which attended it have made an impression upon every mind, which the rust of time will with difficulty efface.

their

their former hostile temper. They instantly re-  
 newed their former groundless objections to the  
 proposed mode; a Congress (which, for its ex-  
 perience adequate utility, has received the grate-  
 ful sanction of Europe) and firmly insisted upon  
 a definitive treaty being immediately set on foot;  
 (forgetting that the question of signing a prelimi-  
 nary or definitive treaty necessarily depends upon  
 the progress and turn of the negotiation) pass-  
 ports were sent, drawn up, however, in terms  
 which they arrogated to themselves the uncon-  
 trollable power of fixing, and to which they  
 expected us to pay the most implicit obedience:  
 they were made out "for a Minister furnished  
 with full powers for the purpose of negotiating  
 a *definitive and separate* treaty of peace with  
 the French Republic." This circumstance  
 was very properly remarked by Lord Grenville,  
 in his answer to the Minister for Foreign Affairs,  
 as "differing from the usual form, by the parti-  
 cular description inserted in them of the na-  
 ture and extent of the powers, and of the mis-  
 sion of the King's Plenipotentiary." They  
 were informed that "his full powers drawn up  
 in the usual form, would include every case,  
 and without prescribing to him any particular

P

"mode



“ mode of negotiation, would give him the most  
 “ unlimited authority to conclude any articles  
 “ or treaties, whether preliminary or definitive,  
 “ as might be best conducive to the speedy re-  
 “ establisment of peace.”

His Majesty, differing so materially from the constant practice of the French Directory, would not suffer puny testiness to interfere in his plan of general humanity, He therefore informed them, that he did not by any means make a point of concluding a preliminary treaty, but would only prefer that mode, whatever it might be, which should be found the best calculated to accelerate the conclusion of peace.

His Majesty added, that “ his Plenipotentiary would be equally ready and authorized to begin the negotiation without delay, upon either footing, upon the footing of a preliminary treaty, or should such continue to be the wish of the Directory, upon that of a definitive treaty.”

With respect to the question of a separate peace, his Majesty assured them, that he would have no objection to settle by a treaty of this  
 kind,

kind, whatever related to the respective interests of France and of Great Britain, as has been usually the practice in similar cases, but that he could not allow any doubts to subsist, as to his intention of providing for what was due to the interests of his ally, her most faithful Majesty. And, in pursuance of the same principles, that his Majesty would not refuse to enter into such explanations with respect to the interests of Spain and Holland, as might appear necessary for the establishment of Peace.

His Majesty likewise informed them, that he had made choice of \*Lord Malmesbury to represent

\* I understand that it has frequently been asserted in this country, that the sending of *Lord Malmesbury* to Lisle is a presumptive proof of our insincerity in the *last* negotiation; and, that the circumstance of *Belgium* being suffered to remain in the hands of the French, notwithstanding the violent struggle made for its recovery by his Lordship at Paris, is a proof of the insincerity of the *first*. Convinced, as I am, of the number and zeal of the advocates of France, I am still inclined to hope, for the credit of British intellect, that so scandalizing a report is unfounded.

I have ever considered the fluctuation of war far beyond the powers of human foresight. The keenest perspicacity is but little able to penetrate with confidence of success into the dark and mysterious womb of fate. It cannot, there-

sent him on this important occasion, for whom he desired a similar passport to that sent for his Lordship in the month of October last.

To fore, be just cause for surprize, that what a Nation, in the pride of possession, flattered herself yesterday was stamped with perpetuity; she, in the agony of separation, laments is torn from her by the fortune of to-day. That the capture, by the strong arm of power, of a cherished and valuable possession necessarily proves that our former affection for it was hypocritical, that our exertions to preserve it were feigned and insincere, and that our present lamentations are forced and unnatural, is a paradox refuted by daily experience. The assertion that our surrender of a fort to superior force necessarily falsifies all our former avowed wishes to maintain it, and invalidates and burlesques our sorrowful expressions of regret at its loss, is a post which all the powers of sophistry, intrenched, as they may be, in the fastnesses of sedition, and sustained by a host of rabble arguments, will find themselves unable to maintain.

That the acknowledged propriety of conduct observed by the noble Ambassador in the former momentous work, should render him totally unfit for the latter, that the happy display of superior talent over an antagonist upon one occasion, necessarily made him incapable of employing it with success upon another, owing to the pulling and trembling caprice (arising from the black malignity of conscious inferiority) of that antagonist; and that the strenuous exertion of patriotic ability, in the defence of the rights and interests of his country, justly merits the opprobrium and calls for the slander (for even the *supposition*, much more the *assertion*, that a man of honor would become the tool of artful insincerity is a most serious stigma) of his countrymen, are a string



To this information, ingenious beyond example, the French Directory returned an answer couched in the most arrogant and offensive language. Sensible how ardently the return of peace was desired by the French nation, they were fearful of producing, however fervently they might personally wish, the rupture of the negotiation in its present stage.—They were forced therefore to agree that his Majesty should make, by his Plenipotentiary, such proposals or stipulations as he should think proper for her most faithful Majesty; as, in return, the Plenipotentiaries of the Republic would do for their allies, his Catholic Majesty and the Batavian Republic. But they still persisted in the desire that the respective Plenipotentiaries should enter immediately upon their meeting, upon the discussion of a string of paradoxes which my poor sagacity is unable to unravel. I must refer them for solution to the disciples of the new school of philosophy and logic.

If this report be well founded, and if this calumnious declaration has really been broached in the face of day, (which I am loth to believe) I would presume to recommend the industrious propagators of such unseemly masses of folly, instead of triumphantly launching them for the ridicule of common sense, to stifle them in their birth as the shapeless offspring of addle brains.

sion of a definitive treaty. To which capricious desire his Majesty, although sensible of the hostile spirit which dictated it, voluntarily acceded.

But unable to conceal that spirit of insult which has incessantly marked their conduct, they had the unqualified effrontery to assure us, that, though they accepted Lord Malmesbury as his Majesty's Plenipotentiary, "another choice" would have appeared to them to augur more "favourably for the speedy conclusion of peace." To hurl foul and injurious sneers at a nation, without being able to assign just reasons for such licentious conduct, is a specimen of outrageous arrogance seldom to be met with. It was, however, perfectly congenial to the temper which ruled the Ministry of France, and may, perhaps, find some excuse in systematic audacity.—They were tormented, it would appear, that his Lordship's well known sagacity and accomplished mind did not dispose him either to become the dupe of their paltry artifice, or to lend himself a tool to their sorry and barbarous policy.—It did not, however, exactly suit the dignity of his Majesty

Majesty to consult his enemies upon the choice of his Ambassador, so that their monitory remark was only rewarded with silent disdain.

But as if this unwarrantable arrogance had not been sufficient to cast some gloom upon the success of the negotiation, they were determined to encrease the opaque cloud that environed our hopes, by expressing a demand of a most insulting nature: they desired, that couriers should not be sent too frequently, the frequent sending of them having been (as they allege) one of the principal causes of the rupture of the former negotiation. A declaration so foul in its nature, and so false in point of fact, certainly merited no other notice than the most contemptuous silence:—foul, since it could have been brought forward solely with a view to poison the progress of the present important affair, by a malicious desire to recal to recollection, (which for their own credit they should have been anxious to have buried in oblivion) the cause of disaster to the former;—and false, since it is known to all Europe, that the sole cause of that failure is to be attributed to the inordinate rapaciousness and incurable rancour of France herself: truths



which the vile mendacities of France need not pretend to impair.

Notwithstanding this insolent and contumelious conduct on the part of his enemies augured inauspiciously for the happy conclusion of the negotiation, and would have justified the King in instantly discontinuing it, still his Majesty resolved to disregard it, though but too well convinced of the noxious fountain whence it sprung, and of its baneful tendency, from a noble and paternal determination that nothing, on his part, should interrupt the grand work which he was about to undertake—the restoration of happiness to harrassed Europe.

Lord Malmesbury consequently repaired to Lisle, (the place appointed by the Directory as the seat of negotiation) furnished with the most ample powers, and instructed to communicate at once an explicit and detailed plan of peace. He delivered, therefore, to the French Ministers, in his first conference with them, a projet just and moderate in its principles, and embracing all the interests of each nation concerned in the restoration of peace. He transmitted to them, at  
their

their request, a confidential note, demonstrating at one view the utmost extent of his Majesty's pretensions, and affording the most favorable opportunity for the examination of every individual claim, for mutual concessions, and for the amicable discussion of every contested point, "as a proof of his readiness to facilitate the progress of the negotiation, by giving them in the very outset all the explanation in his power on the projet of the treaty which he had delivered to them."

To this liberal proceeding no other answer was given than a wish to treat with his Lordship upon detached and collateral points; distinct from the main object of the negotiation, and evidently started with a view to retard its progress, if not totally to defeat its object: since some of these preliminary points could not possibly produce any real advantage to France, and others were of so extravagant a nature that they could not have been anticipated by the wildest speculatist, and certainly could not, in their present crude state, be realized by Great Britain.

These

These insulated points, frivolous as they were, were readily received by his Lordship, and instantly transmitted to his Court; not unconscious of their dangerous tendency, and of their inadequacy to the success of the grand object in view, but firmly determined that no opportunity should be afforded to their captious disposition of complaining of an unwillingness, on the part of the King's Minister, to receive any proposals however futile and contemptible they might be.

This request paved the way, as might readily be supposed, for still more inimical demands. And his Lordship, who had waited with anxious expectation for an answer to his equitable projet, was astonished to find, that, instead of a recognition of the projet, or a declaration of its unfavorable parts, or at least, an offer on their part of a contre-projet, the principle of mutual compensation, so lately admitted by common consent as a just and equitable basis of negotiation, was now suddenly hurled into atoms, and that in its place a demand had arisen of the most unprecedented form, and of the most extravagant nature, born of the most rancorous and insatiate hostility.



hostility.—A demand, no other than (to use the words of his Majesty in his published declaration\*) “ the *absolute and unconditional surrender* “ of all that the energy of his people and the valour “ of his fleets and armies have conquered in the “ present war, either from France or from her “ allies.” A demand so hostile to all moderation or justice, could be brought forward for no other motive than to tear asunder every possibility of mutual agreement, and to launch afresh into the horrors of inevitable war. Such was the unexampled effrontery of the directorial dictators, that they did not even presume to assign this demand as constituting the *terms* of peace, but merely as the *price* of negotiation; it was expressly denominated “ an indispensable “ *preliminary* of the negotiation ;” it was the condition by which this country was permitted to know by what further sacrifices she could hope to obtain the prospect of insecure peace; since by the unqualified surrender of all our means of safety, we could only depend for momentary tranquillity upon the hostile rapacity of an inveterate foe.

\* This, as well as the former, declaration, is a model of official style.

This

This outrageous demand, which was to strip his Majesty of all the fruits of his victories, and, by increasing the strength of the enemy, was to expose his people to the horrors of invasion and slavery, would doubtless have completely justified his Majesty in instantly terminating the pending negotiation, but firmly resolved that nothing, on his part, should militate against so general a blessing as peace; and convinced how sincerely it was desired by Europe, he determined that nothing should be left untried by which it could possibly be procured: He merely contented himself with a firm but conciliatory rejection of this preposterous demand, and in the hope that the Directory would reflect upon the outrageous injustice of their conduct, and be still disposed to follow the once acknowledged principle of mutual concession, he directed that an opening should still be left for treating on such reasonable grounds, as might be compatible with the dignity of his Crown, and the interests and safety of his people.

This conciliatory conduct, so honorable to the benevolence and sincerity of his Majesty's disposition, undeniably challenged a similar conduct

duct on the part of his enemies. It was to be expected, that since their rapacious and sweeping claim destroyed the foundation of his Majesty's proposition, they would, at least, have delivered in their counter-proposition; this expectation was augmented too by the *confession* of the Plenipotentiaries themselves, that it was the *best* and *sole* method to accelerate the business, and that we had an undoubted *right* to expect it; and also from their candid offer to deliver a statement of the proposals which they had to make, in case their insulated points were not agreed to. Sentiments to this effect were consequently expressed by Lord Malmesbury at the next conference he held with the French Plenipotentiaries, and were acknowledged by them to be founded in justice: at the same time they assured him, that they must wait for instructions from the Directory, which they did not doubt they soon would be able to procure. Considerable time elapsed, however, after his Majesty's firm and explicit rejection of the exorbitant demand had been accepted; and some more favourable prospect of successful issue appeared from their openly disclaiming it, and from their confession, that the delay of producing their counter-



counter-proposition solely originated from the intricate difficulties in consulting the various interests of their allies. The counter-proposition was, as may be supposed, anxiously and daily expected by Lord Malmesbury, whose harrassed patience for more than two months, was in some degree exhilarated by the assurance of the Plenipotentiaries, that they had just received a letter from the President of the Directory, stating, that, in a very few days, instructions would be transmitted to them :—Instructions which, they said, would enable them to continue the negotiation without farther interruption.

Instead of having his hopes realized, the British Ambassador received the unpleasant intelligence, that the French Government had thought proper to recall the members of the first legation. New Plenipotentiaries were consequently announced on the part of France. This circumstance could not but be considered by Lord Malmesbury as inauspicious to the speedy and happy conclusion of the negotiation. His fearful anticipations were too fatally verified : as the very first act of the new ministers was to re-

new

new the former preposterous demand, which had been so long abandoned, and even disclaimed, by their predecessors. Its extravagance, indeed, was, if possible heightened by the outrageous and offensive declaration, that it had for its object the speedy and successful termination of the negotiation; and, that upon its instant recognition depended his continuance at Life. The assurance of his Lordship that he was not possessed of powers to acquiesce in a demand which acknowledged no mutual compensation, which scornfully disclaimed all idea of reciprocal concession; which tyrannically proclaimed, that, at the very moment when France, flushed with the possession of stupendous force, and elated with the prospect of speedy success, was preparing to demolish the venerable fabric—the British Empire, all its protecting outworks should be basely abandoned and its impregnable posts ignobly surrendered, in order to accelerate and complete the triumph, and add brilliancy to the arms of our enemies, in the conquest of ourselves; and which was announced not as the final terms, but simply as the *sine qua non* to merely a preliminary discussion, was instantly replied to, by an insolent and peremptory

...order to return to England within twenty-four hours.

This uncivilized and unjustifiable conduct was aggravated by their professing an expectation, that the King's Minister would immediately return to them, notwithstanding this unmerited and tyrannical expulsion. Yet such was their groveling and contemptible artifice, that, with a view to deceive their country by ascribing the failure of the negotiation to the conduct of Great Britain; to conceal their own guilt; and to maintain themselves on the tottering throne of usurped authority; they immediately published, before any answer could arrive from England on the subject of their demand, a most false and flimsy declaration, announcing the departure of his Majesty's Plenipotentiary, and stating it to have proceeded from no visible or assignable reason.

It must be owned, however, that the real cause of the failure of this second attempt to negotiate is now well known. France had, at that moment, a far different object in view than the re-establishment of peace;—an object no less than

the



the complete separation of Ireland from Great Britain, and the formation of it into an independent jacobin republic. Although offers of assistance from France had been tendered and accepted by deputed agents from the Society of United Irishmen, as early, indeed, as the summer of 1796, yet, owing to various circumstances, hopes of complete success to their plan was not then so sanguinely entertained, and, consequently, the machinations of these rebels, though they greatly assisted, did not *solely* produce the rupture of the first negotiation. Of the latter, however, they were the sole cause. After the fortunate failure of their expedition to Bantry Bay, a second attempt was earnestly solicited; and in order to its being speedily procured, an accredited Minister from the rebellious Irish Directory was dispatched to France. The promoter of rebellion was received with natural affection. In August 1797, France animated the united rebels by the assurance, that an armament was then lying in the Texel, with fifteen thousand men on board devoted to their cause. At this moment Lord Malmesbury was at Lille, earnestly endeavouring to re-esta-

blish peace. Resident agents from the Directory of Rebels were as earnestly endeavouring to blast his salutary labours, on account of their direct hostility to their infernal views. They succeeded. Every thing being ripe for execution, Lord Malmesbury was dismissed in September, and the armament was to have sailed instantly for the invasion of Ireland, had not Admiral Duncan completely baffled their designs by his glorious defeat of the *Dutch Fleet* in October. This victory was to Great Britain of value incalculable. It was probably the saviour of Ireland! At that awful juncture, when vast bodies of deluded peasantry had been inflamed into a most sanguinary but causeless rebellion, I shudder when I contemplate the consequences which must have attended the success of their projected enterprize. Well has the heroic veteran merited his honours! Well have his valorous bands deserved their laurels!

But in what language can we express our abhorrence at that immensity of audaciousness which could, at each of our attempts at negotiation, unblushingly, and in open defiance of truth,

truth, violently upbraid us with the crime of  
 perfidy, and vauntingly proclaim the spotless  
 purity of their own good faith, and the sincerity  
 of their own wishes for peace, when it is notori-  
 ous that, at each of those epochs, they were  
 burning with the fiercest and most bloody rage  
 for war; and were plotting with the vilest of  
 our species—our unnatural countrymen, to  
 rush with the most furious rancour, not upon  
 a single fort or town, but upon every thing  
 which constitutes the envied glory and great-  
 ness of Britain.—A plan for the extermination of  
 all who opposed this cruel scheme had long  
 been devised and approved. Peaceful pro-  
 fessions so barefacedly belied by such hostile  
 projects are born of an effrontery which beg-  
 gars invective.

A conduct so unparalleled in the annals of  
 diplomacy, and so deeply rooted in the most  
 inveterate hostility, clearly demonstrates the  
 diabolical spirit which has uniformly influenced  
 the Government of France; and which has  
 left no alternative to this country but to pro-  
 secute, with redoubled energy, a war un-  
 deniably



deniably just in its origin, and rendered incalculably more necessary from the undisguised and increased ferocity of her implacable enemy.

## SECTION IV.

## GENERAL REFLECTIONS.

HAVING shewn the justice of the war from the unprovoked aggressions of France, and having proved its necessity from her savage determination to destroy every possibility of co-existence; having also clearly demonstrated, that its continuance is attributable solely to her boundless ambition, added to a most inveterate implacability, I should deem it a criminal insult to the feelings of Englishmen, to ask them, whether a war so evidently just and necessary on our part, should be carried on with an energy proportionate to the magnitude of the object, and with a resolution and spirit characteristic of the invincible firmness and dauntless valour of Britons? Or, whether we should barely submit without further struggle to an enemy, flattered with the encouragement of temporary success, who has invariably aimed at nothing less than the destruction of that Constitution, upon whose existence depend the unrivalled prosperity and greatness of the British Empire.

## SECTION

denial just in it, and rendered  
calculated more necessary from the un-  
guilt and increased ferocity of her implacable  
enemy

#### SECTION IV.

##### GENERAL REFLECTIONS.

**H**AVING shewn the justice of the war from the unprovoked aggressions of France, and having proved its necessity from her savage determination to destroy every possibility of conciliation : having also clearly demonstrated, that its continuance is attributable solely to her boundless ambition, added to a most inveterate implacability, I should deem it a criminal insult to the feelings of Englishmen, to ask them, whether a war so evidently just and necessary, on our part, should be carried on with an energy proportionate to the magnitude of the object, and with a resolution and spirit characteristic of the inflexible firmness and dauntless valour of Britons? Or, whether we should basely submit, without further struggle, to an enemy, flushed with the encouragement of temporary success, who has invariably aimed at nothing less than the destruction of that Constitution, upon whose existence depend the unrivalled prosperity and greatness of the British Empire?

It is worthy of the most serious reflection, that this determined spirit of aggrandizement and rancour, is not a temporary indisposition, which fours the mind of France, but a systematic and deeply rooted disease, which has incessantly tortured her, and which, by infecting all other nations within the vortex of her baneful influence, has enabled her to take advantage of their deadly torpor, and instantly to complete their destruction.

The subjugation of Europe being the visible object of these modern Huns, what hopes have we of escaping the general ruin, but by an inflexible determination to check the ambition of overgrown oppressors? In this awful hour of peril we should not forget, that these hordes of ravagers, flushed with the insolence of inglorious conquest, drank under the walls of Berne,—destruction to our Empire. Are we to look, then, with calm indifference upon the gigantic force which has long been preparing for our annihilation? When anathemas of destruction are fulminated against us by those whose systematic conduct has been insatiably hostile, and whose rancorous attacks have been interrupted



rupted solely by other temptations : are we to view the impending danger with torpid apathy, and thus fall an easy prey to the most cruel rapacity ? In times of extreme danger to behold, with supine negligence or contemptuous disdain, the approaching calamity, is equally indicative of abject folly, and equally productive of inevitable destruction. What alternative then have we, but to oppose to this stupendous foe the inexhaustible perseverance and undaunted courage, by which Britons have ever been able to resist the attacks, however formidable, of the most acrimonious enemy ? And though the continuance of the war be a ponderous weight, still when it is considered, that it is our only saviour from the horrors either of grinding slavery, or of instant dissolution, it is a weight which self-preservation will cheerfully sustain.

Animated, as a sense of unprecedented danger will, doubtless, make us, we must still reflect, that our utmost exertions will be totally ineffectual, unless they are accompanied and fortified by perfect unanimity. *Parvi sunt arma fortis, nisi sit consilium domi.* This is not a moment for our country, assailed by a formidable

abbe enemy, it to be distracted by private feuds, and personal animosities. The danger which awaits us is not directed to any particular class of men; it is general. It aims equally at the throne, and at the cottages. Its reward will be our complete destruction as a nation. Is this a time, then, for the petty considerations of interest or ambition to influence our conduct? Are we to deny our assistance to our country, struggling with an implacable foe, merely because her affairs may not be conducted by the men we would rather see at her helm? The trifling question, what Minister shall direct and guide our strength, ought surely to sink before the awful consideration of the indispensable necessity for cordial co-operation. This question is, at this time, peculiarly dangerous and offensive, unless it were clearly proved, that the momentous affairs of the country can be more successfully managed by others, who are more able to extricate her from her present troubles, and who would have been more capable of conducting her through the unforeseen events of a war anomalous in its nature, and unprecedented in its difficulties.—This proof is deducible only from a review of the political conduct of the

Jon the

the candidates for power: we shall then see whether they have shewn themselves more anxious, than the present rulers, to assist their country in their perilous distresses. As a discovery to which, I confess, I am unable to make, and consequently an opinion which, as an unbiassed individual, I cannot, in justice, maintain, I unite less strenuous opposition to her struggles in the preservation of her independence, be synonymous with heroic exertion and patriotic zeal. I have, I indeed ever considered party to be the most dangerous evil which can attach itself to a State in the hour of calamity. It is a mill-stone which has hung round the neck of this country, and impeded her in the resistance of foreign attacks, almost incessantly since the era of the Revolution. If it could be confined to its primitive and genuine use, that is, to watch over the rights of the people, and to control the irregularities of the Executive Power, it would then be, from the purity of its views, tolerable and even laudable. But to that duty alone should it strictly apply itself. If, from personal motives, it exceeds that boundary, it instantly becomes destructive prostitution. It should be remembered, that to guard the interests of a nation, is not



not to desert them; and to check licentiousness, is not uniformly to oppose necessary exertion.— Is this purity of conduct observed? No! Far from it. Party seems now to have no other object than to counteract the designs, and to confine the efforts, of a people contending for their dearest interests. Its once venerable temple is now converted into a lazaretto for all the malignant diseases of the State, and forms the point of union and concentration for cold and malicious disaffection, for desperate and cruel ambition, and for crossed and blasted hopes.

Among the numerous writers who have endeavoured to describe the nature of party, I have ever thought Dean Swift the most happy in his definition of it.—“Party,” says he, “is the madness of many, for the gain of a few.” This is the aphorism of a man, whose natural sagacity, nourished by an unrestrained intimacy with the heads of the alternatively prevailing factions which distinguish his day, made him perfectly acquainted with its noxious tendency, and fully competent to delineate its hideous form. Tolerable as it may be in the gay and tranquil season of peace, it is absolutely in-

tolerable

tolerable in the tempestuous hour of war. The cultivation of it by the higher orders, who generally influence imitation, is injudicious and destructive. The adoption of it by the lower classes, who naturally imitate what they cannot understand, is offensive and baneful. The former virtually generate the disasters produced by the latter: the latter nourish the growth of the former.—Both have one common and final tendency, to change the channel of unanimous and effectual operation, and to turn its salutiferous waters, either into the noxious stream of rapid sedition, or into the stagnant reservoir of poisonous opposition. By my reprehension of party, it is not to be imagined, that I mean to censure all political connections. Far from it. Between an harmonious combination of talent and virtue, by whose united sagacity the deepest dangers are fathomed, and by whose allied strength the most tremendous calamities are averted or subdued; and a heterogeneous faction, in which the most desperate caballers are united together for the purpose of traversing the designs, and opposing the progress of *all* the measures which a Government may find essential to the welfare of a nation, the difference is

alike

this country have been received by the minority  
 of a certain great Assembly, has been the sub-  
 alike immense and indescribable. It is, indeed,  
 great consolation to reflect, that one fatal root  
 of contention and strife, which has, not unfre-  
 quently, shaken this Empire to its centre, (it  
 will readily be imagined that I allude to the de-  
 structive conflicts of Whiggism and Toryism,)  
 has now happily withered almost to a mere name.  
 This once powerful foe of unanimity and peace  
 is now dwindled to a skeleton; but still it is  
 a baneful skeleton, and calls upon loyalty  
 to crush it: For out of its mouldering and  
 putrid carcase have issued swarms of noxious  
 and rebellious clubs, which, by various systema-  
 tic plans, have entered into a formidable league  
 to corrupt the minds of Britons, and thus to  
 accomplish the ruin of our country. This con-  
 sideration should, in my humble opinion, have  
 induced *all* the members of the British Senate  
 to forget, for a time, their less important en-  
 mities, to unite in a just execration of, and firm  
 opposition to, the common enemy, and to shew  
 what mighty achievements united Britons can  
 effect.

The callous indifference, with which the  
 ferocious and incessant insults of France towards  
 this



this country have been received by the minority of a certain great Assembly, has been the subject of surprize and indignation. Her most violent atrocities were, by them, seldom, if ever, checked by censure, or discouraged by reproach: attempts have been made either to vindicate them as equitable, or to crown them with the eulogy of magnanimity and wisdom. Their most flagrant acts of insult and aggression were thus warmed by the genial fire of apparent approbation, and cherished into strength, by those whose duty commanded them to repel them with vigour, and to animate their countrymen to crush the power of so acrimonious a foe. Was it impossible to condemn those measures of our own, which might to *them* have appeared improper, without thus directly commending those of our enemies? Was it impracticable to disapprove (according to *them*) of the mal-administration of the public affairs of this country, without opposing, with a furious and indiscriminate zeal, all her schemes of defence against the attacks of a formidable foe? England was not wont to see her interests so basely deserted!

Fuit hæc sapientia quondam,

*Publica privatis secernere, sacra profanis.*—

Was the callous indifference with which the atrocious and incessant insults of France towards this

—Was it not inconsistent with the honor of British Senators to besinear with obloquy and to enfeeble by reproach, those measures which loyalty found essential to her existence; and thereby to inflame the crowd of imitators who are influenced solely by the example of their leaders, and who, thus supposing them oppressive and useless, would deny their assistance, and defeat their effect? It was their duty to co-operate with the Government in the formation of plans adequate to the magnitude of a peril which equally threatened Ministry, Opposition, and all classes of men, instead of steadfastly thwarting them by reprehension, and resistance. The duty was indispensable: the omission, unpardonable. It should have been firmly demanded by the Executive Power, not as tending to personal gratification, but to the national service: It should have been said to them, with a commanding dignity suitable to the channel through which the power of the nation flows—

*Si quid novisti rectius istis,*  
*Candidus imperet: tibi, non, tibi, non, tibi, non, tibi, non,*

It will ever appear a blot upon the humanity and manliness of their parliamentary conduct, that

that they, whose feelings were tremblingly alive  
 to the merited sufferings of a man, who had no  
 other claim upon their compassion than as the  
 constant and avowed enemy of their country,  
 and who had taken the most unequivocal steps  
 to evince it; who had no other claim upon the  
 pity and clemency of the Emperor, than as the  
 grinning reviler of fallen Majesty, (of those  
 august but persecuted personages who were  
 allied to him by the most tender ties) and as the  
 Captain-General of that Banditti, who, in the  
 awful hour of midnight, forced the Castle of  
 Versailles, and with brutal triumph raked the  
 bowels of the faithful Swiss-guards, who were  
 butchered upon the very steps of the throne  
 when shielding, with their bodies, their adored  
 Sovereign; could contemplate with calm and  
 cruel apathy the sufferings of a Briton groaning  
 under the weight of massy and unmerited chains.  
 Their humanity which had travelled with furious  
 haste to redeem from the jaws of *Olmütz* the  
 apostate *La Fayette*, was not at leisure to step  
 as far as *Paris* to lead from a loathsome dungeon  
 their gallant countryman Sir Sidney Smith: a  
 commander who had, in the opinion of his  
 sanguinary judges, rendered himself deserving

of



of a most galling captivity, by his indefatigable acts of heroism in the service of his country, which, it was natural to expect, would have made a forcible appeal to the heart of every Briton.—Whence springs this unheard of perversion of sentiment and feeling?—from a fountain, which, unfortunately, does not conceal itself, (as it should) from the eyes of man, but which triumphs with bold and indecent exultation over the virtuous efforts of disinterested honor:—Party spirit. This is the noxious vapour which poisons the vegetation of successful vigour, and dwarfs the growth of manly sentiment. Whether this deplorable malady arises from a depraved heart, or from a distempered brain has long been a subject of political pyrrhonism—

— Furor ne cæcus, an rapit vis acrior

An culpa? —

This is not the only instance of the miserable effect of party-spirit. We have other and more calamitous examples which recall to our painful remembrance its destructive consequences. Though I cannot be insensible to the profound and logical eloquence of a Fox, or to the elegant

great variety of talents which distinguished a Sheridan, on added to the different accomplishments of the other members of that once powerful, but now defunct band, called Opposition: still must I deplore that spirit of party, which could induce them to withdraw their assistance, at a moment of unparalleled horror and tempest, when the disasters of their country so imperiously called for a unanimity of council and combination of exertion; when the distracted mother, in all the agonies of convulsion, and phrenzy of despair, seemed to await her final doom from the patricide hands of her unnatural children; when, to use the words of Tacitus—"Ipse capitolio oivium manibus incenso"—"*Quo et terrore, scripti in dominos servi, in patronos liberti.*" It was not surely a proof of patriotism, of which they are so clamorously ostentatious, and which they would arrogate exclusively to themselves, to refuse to strengthen by their co-operation the arm of Government, at a time, when of all others, it would have been most

It will be said, perhaps, that Mr. Sheridan attended his duty in Parliament, at the time of the mutiny. I allow it. But that niggardly assistance that seems extorted from an enemy when he finds his character is at stake, is not to be dignified with the epithet of patriotic co-operation.

R

useful :

useful: The various shades of party ought surely to have been dissolved, at the most dreadful moment \*that this country ever saw, when the helm seemed entirely deserted, except by that chosen band, who, firm in her cause, and fearless of personal danger, guided the state vessel through the troubled ocean of intestine rebellion into the harbour of tranquillity and content.

But I would draw a veil over the temporary delusions, under which some of the bravest sons of Britain so miserably laboured, and the lamentable neglect of the sacred duties of allegiance and submission, by which they had nearly incurred everlasting infamy: as their conduct has since afforded us the fullest and most unequivocal proof, that although the morbid poison of disaffection had, by the insidious arts of wily and malicious miscreants, tainted their bold minds, and although it was rapidly circulating through the various arteries, it had not reached their valiant but too credulous hearts: By the skilful treatment of the State Physicians

*Ipse diem noctemque negat discernere celo  
Nec meminisse viæ mediâ Palinurus in undâ.*

the



the disease was overpowered, and the patients, convinced that their illness was produced by their own bad conduct, were happily restored to their former sanity of body and of mind. The stain which had dropped upon the laurel entwined round Britannia's shield, was, ere it made an impression, for ever wiped off by one of the most brilliant and valuable victories that ever graced her naval annals.

The conduct of opposition in this momentous affair defies all justification. I am happy, indeed, to find that no one has had sufficient audacity to attempt it. The most dexterous powers of sophistry would only render themselves contemptible. Their distinguished leader cannot fly for refuge to the assertion, that, as he is merely the representative of an individual city, he is solely charged with the office of defending her individual interests; and consequently, that as long as his public conduct is not offensive to his constituents he acknowledges no other authority.—His profound knowledge of the constitution of his country will not permit him to have recourse to a support so baseless and impotent. He well knows, that to

neglect the interests of any particular city, is to desert those of the whole empire: since any disaster which that torpidity and dereliction of vigilance might generate, would not be confined to that particular city, but would extend itself to every part of the kingdom. Besides, if this neglect of duty be allowable to one, it is indisputably equally permissible to all, and consequently we lie exposed to the danger of having our liberties open to the attacks of our enemies. The consequence of such a general conduct must be our ruin as a nation, since if all the guardians of our freedom were allowed to sleep upon their watch, it would soon become the prey of an hostile invader. As a member of the British senate he is invested by his country with the sacred office of protecting her rights and preserving her privileges; and this awful responsibility is increased in proportion to the talents of the guardian,—the more he has, the more shall be required of him. Will he cringe then, into the paltry excuse, that as he does not partake of the offices of ministry, he is totally absolved from the duty of interfering in the concerns of his country.

Will

Will it be said, that because he was not Chancellor of the Exchequer or Secretary of State, he had no concern whatever in the affairs of his country, and was entirely excused from all anxiety whether she recovered or perished? Besides, to every part of the kingdom neglect of duty be allowable to one, it is indelible. Will a discerning nation exonerate him from the guilt of pertinaciously denying his assistance when she was in the most perilous extremity, and pardon him for shrouding himself in dastardly security till the storm should blow over, or till the coasts should be covered with the fragments of the wreck?

His injured country will rather fervently deprecate his ever being entrusted with the management of her affairs, from the experience with what ease he can divest himself of the solemn duty, for the consideration of personal motives: and impartial posterity will attach no small share of disgrace to the name of that man, who could, from a disappointment in the sweets of office, have the cruelty to neglect his country in her most dire calamities, and who could



have the effrontery to cover such baseness of conduct with the shield of patriotism!

The recent and indefatigable exertions of the opposition, in behalf of a man long stigmatized by public opinion, is a subject upon which their bitterest enemies will have too much tenderness to dwell. Benevolence will be loth to harbour a suspicion, that they were conscious that the man, to whose protection from the punishment due to his enormous crimes, they had hurried with such disgraceful zeal, upon whose political conduct they were so lavish in their eulogies, and whose opinion upon public affairs they so solemnly declared to be perfectly *congenial to their own*, had long been a most villainous traitor to his country, and had been commissioned with the heinous office of betraying her to her most implacable enemy. Should the attempt to palliate this seeming criminality by indulging the hope, that they were ignorant of the man whom they were striving to defend, and whose character they proclaimed to be immaculate, prudence will instantly affirm, that it will become the sober dignity of British Senators to betray that inde-

cent

indeed.

R

cent excess of friendship towards a man, upon whom a most awful cloud at that time hung, who had notoriously been long obnoxious to the government of his country for his \*virulent and seditious publications, and whose guilt, if once proved, would inevitably cover them with immortal disgrace. To avoid a more serious imputation, they can fly for refuge only to the confession, that they were the dupes of artful villainy. In either case they are overwhelmed with indelible infamy. Into such a mysterious transaction every charitable man will, indeed, be loth to pry: his utmost disposition towards clemency, will not, however, be able to prevent him from being impressed with a conviction, that had they not, by their former conduct, forfeited all claim to public confidence: this alone is more than sufficient to deter a nation from resigning herself into the power of men, whose conduct wears so "questionable a shape." Should we commit the helm into such suspicious hands, we would,

\* The Press, of which Arthur O'Connor was the well-known Editor, was by far the most licentious of all the Jacobinical newspapers with which Ireland swarmed, and was, from its extreme circulation, the most instrumental in poisoning the minds of the illiterate and credulous peasantry.

indeed, deserve to have the vessel founder on a rocky and to be drowned ourselves for such blind temerity. Impartial men, who place confidence in performances, and not in professions so directly belied by deeds, naturally ask themselves—would it be consistent with personal safety to withdraw our exertions from men who have firmly and systematically opposed the enemy of Great Britain, and who have failed only in effecting a Herculean labour, to the performance of which no mortal power has hitherto been adequate—the complete destruction of the Gallic hydra? Would it be compatible with our duty to deny our aid to that set of men, who have, notwithstanding the immense and almost insurmountable disadvantages under which they have laboured—notwithstanding the seditious and indefatigable opposition at home, and the unexpected treachery of alliance abroad, conducted our forces with such skill and success as to cripple one of the principle limbs of the enemy—her navy; and completely to exhaust her revenue? Are these considerations which should lead us to place our confidence in other men, who can shew no other claim



claim to our notice, than perfect indifference to the menaces of our united enemies, when, in the pride of overgrown strength, they were preparing to overwhelm us with instantaneous destruction; who can produce no other title to our confidence than a vain boast of patriotic motives, so flatly contradicted by their systematic conduct. These reflections naturally suggest the danger of sinking the anchor of our hopes in such a shallow and muddy bottom. It calls to mind, likewise, the audacious prostitution of that august word—patriotism! That venerable name by which the services of an Aristides or a Cincinnatus, in the cause of their country, were characterised for the admiration and example of unborn ages, is now basely employed for the prosecution of the vilest deeds. It is when clothed in this armour, that men rise to rebel against their King, and to fire their country by revolt. Ignorance readily supposes, that every man who spurns at privileged orders, and reviles established rules, must necessarily be a patriot. No idea can be more insane and perilous. “A patriot,” says Doctor Johnson, “is he whose public conduct is regulated by *one single motive*—the welfare of his country.”

"*tive—the love of his country.*" He is not, it must be observed, worthy of so honorable an appellation who performs (or *promises* to perform) some little service to his country, merely in the hope of doing a greater to himself.—Promises of patriotic self-denial derive weight solely from the characteristic disposition of the person who makes them. Assertions which would be credited from Cardinal Ximenes, would be doubted from Cardinal Richlieu. True patriotism is not to be expected in the cringes of an interested sycophant; much less is she to be found revelling in the Thracian orgies of a drunken demagogue, whom the fumes of Falernian inspire with eloquence to belch out volutes of public vice

\* I cannot conceal my admiration of a most accurate definition of this venerable character which has been recently given by a valuable friend, who is not less distinguished for his eminence in the ranks of literature, than for all those amiable virtues which adorn private life.

—He who, *active* in his country's cause,

Asserts her liberties, *maintains* her laws;

Whose upright mind pursues no private end,

At once the *Monarch's* and the *People's* friend.

See the "Address on the Anniversary of the Literary Fund, May 3d, 1799; by William Thomas Fitz Gerald,

Esq."

reform, that patient of all the biding ill of the State, from whose noxious bottom crawl  
out

tue. She does not assist at the celebration of the  
*Dionysia* in honor of an ambitious title, nor will  
 she be heard rending the air with wild and raptu-  
 rous acclamations of *Io! Io! Euen Basche!*  
 It is a feeling; not an assertion. It is a virtue;  
 not a boast. It is evinced by performance; not  
 by promise. The name of patriot is, certainly,  
 a fine, magnificent, high-sounding title, admir-  
 ably formed to captivate the blind affections of  
 the mob, and to split the ears of the unsuspect-  
 ing groundlings. That it is a title which, in the  
 hands of wily talent, may be used with wonder-  
 ful *personal* advantage, no man will surely deny:  
 but that it has rarely, if ever, in modern days,  
 been *assumed* for the *public* utility alone, is a truth  
 which is unfortunately attested by experience.  
 This is the captivating charmer which over-  
 powers and seizes upon the hearts of credulity  
 and ignorance, by assuring them that they suffer  
 hardships which they do not feel; and that they  
 labour under difficulties, of which they never  
 before heard. This enchantment is completely  
 rivetted by the promise of removing these ideal  
 distresses. — Hence springs the notion of radical  
 reform, that parent of all the blighting insects  
 of the State, from whose noxious bosom crawl  
 out



but false liberty and insane equality, and all the brood of pestiferous vipers which gnaw the vitals of every regular Government.

Without pretending to enter into a minute discussion of the grand and complex question of Parliamentary Reform; (which would ill suit the limits of a publication already growing beyond its intended size) I may still be permitted, perhaps, to make upon it a few brief observations.

The substance of the complaints which I have heard preferred against the present mode of representation, is, that the duration of Parliament is too long; and that the system of corruption is too immense. The latter of these evils is affirmed to be greatly occasioned by the former. To the first of these, it may be answered, that the pernicious effects inseparable from frequent elections have rendered the preference of septennial, to triennial, Parliaments absolutely necessary. An annual Parliament would consequently be still more fertile in ruinous disorders. The remedy would, therefore, be infinitely worse than the disease. But if by shortening the duration of Parliament, it is expected, that the un-

due influence, which (according to the reformers) at present exists, will be destroyed, it must be confessed, that the means are totally inadequate to the end. If in the septennial contests between influence and independence the former is generally victorious, the frequency of the conflict would tend only to exhaust the latter, which is already avowed to be the weaker party. Thus then the intended purpose would be defeated. The evil would, indeed, be materially encreased. As long as the appetite that craves, and the food by which it is nurtured, are in existence, bribery, more or less, must prevail. Such imperfections are, perhaps, inseparable from the frailty of human institutions.

The wild plan of universal suffrage is now, I believe, (except by the Corresponding Society, and other execrable factions in alliance with it) exploded. Its warmest admirers, now see that France herself, who sat out with forming her new-fangled government upon that principle, was soon obliged to abandon a theory realized by the most horrible disorders which have ever afflicted a nation since the days of the Huns. Had not this example afforded us an antidote against so fatal an infection, prudent

tent men would have been deterred from countenancing a theory so visibly pregnant with inevitable disasters, till, at least, it had been demonstrated to be capable of practical benefit. Those who, from ignorance of its *real* effects, may have been formerly inclined to favour it, will now, from ample experience, heartily reprobate so pernicious a scheme, and fervently lament their ill-founded admiration.

To the charge of corruption it may be replied, that, if the remedy is supposed to lay in the amputation of (what is vulgarly called) rotten boroughs, it should be maturely considered, that upon this subject reverend authorities rise on each side to stop the danger of presumptuous change. It is worthy of serious reflection, that Junius himself, the avowed champion of popular liberty, was terrified at the idea of so dangerous a project. He not only "questions the power of the legislature to disfranchise them," but dreads a measure pregnant with such probable calamities. "When you propose," says he, "to cut away the rotten parts, can you tell us what parts are perfectly *sound*? Are there any limits, in fact, or in theory, to inform us at what point you must stop, at what point  
 " the



"the mortification ends." When the vein is  
 once opened, who will have the boldness to say  
 when the bleeding will stop? And when it is  
 reflected, that *one unnecessary drop* may be fatal,  
 what prudent man would feel inclined to sanc-  
 tion so desperate an enterprise, even *had* he been  
 convinced of its *necessity*? No man would  
 cheerfully consent, I believe, to the amputation  
 of a limb because it merely gave him a trifling  
 pain. And when it is considered that in the  
 safety of the Constitution the liberties and lives  
 of millions are involved, who will recommend a  
 wanton mutilation of the body politic?  
 Thus then it is evident, that these alleged  
 imperfections cannot be rectified without a fun-  
 damental alteration of this ancient and august  
 edifice. But if it be admitted, that some bo-  
 roughs are *theoretically* defective, it is not to be  
 denied that their *practical* effects are salutary and  
 invaluable. That our inestimable Constitution  
 pours forth a copious stream of general and un-  
 paralleled felicity, will be denied only by that  
 sanguinary wretch, whom nothing but a system  
 of the most horrible anarchy can delight, by  
 which he might feast upon the wounds of his  
 bleeding

bleeding country. Shall a rash appetite then for innovation hurry us to the perilous attempt to alter a system, from which we enjoy real happiness, for the chance of generating, at best trifling advantage, and at the risk of involving us in irremediable miseries? In our passage through the boundless ocean of alteration, when we are lulled into security by the prospect of the long wished-for harbour, we often find ourselves suddenly founder on a sand-bank.—It happens, not unfrequently, in these dangerous adventures, that when we are rioting in exultation at our escape from one rock, we find ourselves split upon another. *Incidit in Scyllam qui vult vitare Charybdim*, is a truth which was never so valuable as at this moment. We should be deterred from entering this gloomy and ruinous labyrinth by the monitory declaration of a profound statesman.—“Our Constitution,” says Lord \* Bolingbroke, “is not like the schemes of some politicians, a jumble of disjointed, incoherent whimsies, but a noble and a wise system, the essential parts of which are so proportioned,

\* However licentious and superficial this splendid writer may be esteemed as a *Philosopher*, his claim to the epithet of *accomplished Statesman* will not be disputed.

“and

and so intimately connected, that a change in  
 "one begets a change in the whole." It may,  
 indeed, be asked—What more than real liberty  
 can any human establishment be rationally ex-  
 pected to bestow? It should truly be contem-  
 plated with heart-felt gratitude, that no other  
 system can be said to be its rival.

But if the diagnostics of the disease were ap-  
 parent, the appropriate remedy would, doubt-  
 less, be equally apparent. Such, however, is  
 the difference, that every class has its particular  
 prescription; each sect its peculiar method of  
 cure: and all the state-empyrics, with which  
 this country unfortunately swarms, are divided  
 in their opinion as to the suitable remedy. Gen-  
 tle bleeding is recommended by some;—the  
 more violent applications of the caustic or the  
 knife are warmly advised by others. Many, in  
 truth, seriously propose, in imitation of Pro-  
 crustes, to lop off some limbs, and to stretch  
 others. Prescriptions so widely different in their  
 nature and effects, might induce a man, prima  
 facie, to suppose that these constitution-doc-  
 tors were at perpetual variance and jar; but it  
 must be observed, that though they differ as to



the particular medicine, they all agree in their wishes to procure the *same* effect. They have what can attract to one focus the most discordant tempers:—the self-same object in view. This is a cement which can unite a band of conspirators, however heterogeneous they may otherwise be, in their dispositions and humours. This is the charm which, according to the authority of the Captain-General of disaffection, instantly produces the firmest coalition. *Idem velle, ac idem nolle*, says Cataline, *ea demum amicitia est*. Never was this maxim more strikingly verified than it is at this instant!

But we are ready to encounter the ridicule of those who will triumphantly ask—Whether it necessarily follows, that because doctors may widely differ about a visible disease, the patient must be well? We answer, most assuredly not. Difference in opinion can, in that case, arise solely from the most deplorable ignorance. If they are willing, however, to allege that the cases are analogous, they must be so in all their parts. If the data are similar, the inference must be equally so. — Ignorance is the shell, then, to which they must seek: and our opinion,

nion,

nion, by way of corollary, is, that it ill becomes men of such pitiable barbarism, to presume to the difficult office of altering the noblest monument that human policy has hitherto erected.

But to consider their vaunted analagous case. — If a *few* members of our College of Physicians were materially to dissent in opinion from the majority, and were to affirm, that a man was dangerously ill; and if his complaint was, at the same time, so *doubtful*, that some treated it as the gout; some as a putrid fever; others as a gangrened habit, violently insisting upon amputating some particular limb; and others again were for trying experiments upon him, (as upon mice in an air pump,) in the hope of *detecting* his disease; we should be inclined to agree with the *majority*, that the man was sound and sane, and that these vicious quacks were only studying how to torture him to death, in order that they might obtain him as a subject for dissection.

My opinion of the falsity of the proclaimed necessity for reform is, I confess, strongly fortified by the reflection, that, had it been so

indisputably manifest, Mr. Fox would certainly have proposed it, at the time, when, from his situation and influence, he would have been fully competent to carry it into effect. Had it been so indispensably requisite he would, doubtless, have seized upon the first moment of his power, to evince his real love for the happiness of his countrymen; he would have reflected upon the instability of human affairs, — that the instant neglected, was, perhaps, irrecoverably lost; and consequently would have proved his zeal for the interests of the people, by attending to the alleged distresses, proceeding from what is now described to be the source of all calamities, instead of amusing himself with rearing a huge and terrific pile, and, like Samson, crushing himself with its ruins. It should be recollected also, that this favorable moment intervened between the æra when Mr. Pitt professed himself to be an advocate for reform, (for which he is now praised by all the apostles of that creed,) and the period of his now deprecating it; (for which Mr. Fox and others so severely censure him;) so that, had its necessity ever existed, it must have been then in full force: and Mr. Fox, in not taking advantage of the auspicious



auspicious interval, must be guilty of a most flagrant breach of public duty. It must be owned too, that the comparison of propriety of time is greatly in favor of the former, since the time when he raised the cry in its behalf was free from internal danger; but the period when the latter has chosen to be its zealous advocate, is when the country is deeply engaged in a war of a difficulty and peril unprecedented in the annals of the world, and when foreign hostile principles, and domestic treason, have entered into a most awful alliance for the utter destruction of our empire.

The pretended zeal in the cause of Parliamentary Reform is, we know, studiously displayed by almost every man who wishes to be adorned by the title of *Poplicola*, and, elevated by the applauses of a deluded mob, to arrive at the summit of his ambition. It is, however, a delusion of the most criminal and fatal nature; since by its influence, many are its partizans who, had they ability to discern its real effects, would sincerely abhor it; and by its genial heat innumerable swarms of locusts are warmed into  
 § 3 strength,

strength, possessed of no other hope and design than to turn the wholesome soil of Great Britain into a Lazaretto for the residence of infection and death. Reform, it should be considered, is the key by which sedition opens the door of revolution, to let loose anarchy and rapine.

It is to be observed too, that the difference is immense, between those who would poison the Constitution with deliterious physic from a gallic dispensary, which must infallibly produce its destruction, and those who would infuse into it salutiferous restoratives ; as was the intention of some of the former advocates for reform, and as is, I doubt not, the wish of some of those who now so strenuously recommend it. Far, very far be it from me to harbour a suspicion, that every man who professes himself a partizan of reform is influenced by any evil intention ! God forbid that I should suppose, that *some* who wish to introduce it may not have the most virtuous motives ! Making this declaration, (which I do with all possible chearfulness) I may be permitted, I hope, to aver, that I do not feel much respect for those speculatists who, out of mere impetuous pruriency for change, and to display  
their

their dexterity in new-modelling empires, are incessantly hurling their slander against this noble edifice. Its well-disposed advocates should be deterred from pleading this dangerous cause, from the knowledge, that France has huddled into one indiscriminate mass *all* the defenders of reform, and considers them her most staunch and trusty friends. I cannot, therefore, abstain from giving it as my most serious opinion, that no doctrine can be so dangerous and fatal; since by being espoused by virtuous men, it strengthens and encourages a desperate faction quibus nulla ex honesto spes.

I am not intimidated, by the ridicule which I expect to incur from some opponents, from affirming that a reform, admitting it, for the sake of argument, to be necessary, would at this critical moment be peculiarly perilous. The sharp sneer attached to the word common-place is a weapon in the hands of some puny corps of reasoners, which supplies the place of sound argument, and by which they flatter themselves they can put to flight a host of hostile syllogisms. But be it recollected by these warriors in the intellectual field, that a common-place is not



of necessity ludicrous and nugatory. The dread of carrying a lighted candle into a magazine replete with powder is not, I believe, necessarily contemptible, because it happens not to be new.

I will ask—is it a fit moment to open the sluices of innovation when the floods of external destruction, and the springs of intestine faction, are united to rush like a tempestuous torrent, and instantly to overwhelm us? Is it a proof of skillful or prudent generalship to destroy the protecting outworks, to raze to the ground all the strong and tenable fortifications, and thus, by placing in the hands of an inward sanguinary foe, leagued with an outward ferocious enemy, all the means of defence, to surrender with rash and base pusillanimity the tower of our strength?

I am not in the habit of quoting the authority of the execrable Robespierre, but this maxim, too fatally sanctified by experience, should be an awful warning to all sober and reflecting men.—“*On ne conspireroit jamais, si le*  
*“ mot REFORME ne precedoit le mot de Revolution.*”

"*tion.*" This aphorism, coming, as it does, from an experienced miner, would be entitled to implicit belief, even had it not been verified by the recent conduct of the rebels in Ireland.

It is notorious, that their atrocious designs were couched under the bewitching and delusive names of Catholic Emancipation, and Parliamentary *Reform*. By these ostensible objects, allied with the most false and inflammatory doctrines propagated through the medium of the \* press, and other engines of sedition, the minds of immense bodies of credulous peasantry were fatally poisoned. By these malignant

\* The attempts of this vile paper (published by Arthur O'Connor) to seduce the soldiery, and to poison the fountains of science, must shock, I think, the feelings of every well-formed mind. The former were too invulnerably shielded by the virtue of their cause, and too deeply convinced of the sacred duty of allegiance to be conquered by such weak and wicked arts. The minds of the Students of Trinity College were too richly stored with lettered loyalty to be corrupted by such ignorant and filthy libels.—They were too well versed in political science not to acknowledge the truth of the declaration of Claudianus—

*Fallitur, egregio quisquis sub principe credit.*

*Servitium, nunquam libertas gratior extat*

*Quam sub REGE FIO.*

subtleties

subtleties these deluded wretches were insensibly impelled to unite themselves into a compact awful from its magnitude and cohesion, and fortified by a more than *eleusinian* secrecy to which they were solemnly sworn. The real design of the chiefs of the conspiracy were, however, from the very \* *commencement* of their association, to sever Ireland from Great Britain, to form her into an independent jacobin-democracy, to demolish every vestige of law and of religion, and to establish under the auspices, and by the assistance of France, a regular system of anarchy; which was to be effected by the massacre of all who, from their principles or situation, were obstacles to their plan, and by the confiscation of their property.

Nothing can betray such weakness as to imagine, that any moderate reform could have contented a banditti aspiring at the grandeur of revolution. The recent conduct of France

\* This is sufficiently evident from the letter of Theobald Wolfe Tone, published in the Report of the Secret Committee of the Irish House of Commons — This report discloses a rebellion which, though it will astonish and shock, should, at the same time, rouse to vigilance and courage, every loyal man.

should



should protect every man from forming so absurd an opinion. It is, indeed, frankly avowed by one of the principal \* leaders of this unnatural rebellion, that, "They had given up all idea of "reform," and were determined on republicanism." Such a boon would consequently have tended only to assist these traitors in their desperate plans, by delivering up the outward and strongest gate, and to exhilarate them in the prosecution of their diabolical designs.

Why have I made this seeming digression?—

To display the real extent of that rebellion, a *fac simile* of which a faction has long been striving to produce in this kingdom. This is no vague assertion: It is discernable by every man who will not suffer himself to be blinded by the thick film of party. These horrible wishes have long been latent, but they lately burst out with an unparalleled blaze of impudence. Hoc vero occultum, intestinum, domesticum malum, non modo existit, verum etiam

\* Dr. McNevin, who was sent to Paris as Minister from the Rebel Directory, for the purpose of imploring the completion of the long promised armament for the invasion of Ireland.

opprimit,

*opprimi, antequam perspicere atque explorare  
potueris.*

It has, indeed, long been known, and so-  
lemnly affirmed, (and it has been as solemnly  
*denied* by those whose declarations bear too  
much popular weight to be wantonly made,)  
that vast bodies of abandoned desperadoes have  
*long* carried on, in this country, under this spe-  
cious name of *reform*, the most atrocious acts  
of treason. But since that all-seeing Providence,  
who seems to have taken this country under his  
peculiar guardianship, has been graciously pleas-  
ed to stretch out his arm and save her from the  
unspeakable afflictions which were ready to burst  
upon her, shall we despise the heavenly inter-  
position, and spontaneously rush into the jaws  
of destruction? Shall we not profit by the de-  
tection of that most extensive and sanguinary  
conspiracy, in which the numerous gangs of se-  
ditionists of England, Scotland, and Ireland,  
were most closely interwoven, for the speedy  
perpetration of those nefarious plans, which had  
been concerted as long ago as at the commence-  
ment of the war; but which, though nourished  
into the most formidable strength and audacity,  
by

by hopes and promises of assistance from France, have been continually baffled and defeated by the well-timed vigorous and spirited measures of Government, and have at length happily been discovered by its unceasing vigilance ? This conspiracy, for impenetrable and mysterious secrecy, for systematic and extensive design, and for atrocious views, is unparalleled in the annals of human wickedness, and defies the powers of language to describe. It had no less an object, than, with the help of the patroness of all crimes, to erect three distinct jacobin-republics in England, Scotland, and Ireland ; which were to be built upon the ruins of the British Constitution, and cemented with the blood of our august and virtuous Sovereign, his amiable family, and many of the members of each Senate ! And shall we contemplate with indifference this projected scheme of *Parthenian* massacre, and fly to the aid of a banditti infinitely more cruel in their designs than the factions of the Guelfs and Ghibelines, by which Italy and Germany were so long worried, by making a breach through which they may triumphantly enter, to demolish the castle of true liberty, and to put all its virtuous inhabitants to the sword ? Shall

we



we help them to lay in ashes the glorious fabric of our Constitution? “ \* Videor enim mihi  
 “ hanc urbem videre, lucem orbis terrarum, at-  
 “ que arcem omnium gentium, subito uno in-  
 “ cendio concidentem : cerno animo sepulta in  
 “ patria miseros, atque insepultos acervos ci-  
 “ vium.” I think I see some fortunate conspi-  
 rator sitting upon the ruins of our liberty, con-  
 templating the horrible effects of his cruel am-  
 bition, and reflecting, with equal astonishment  
 and contempt, upon the blind and fatal cow-  
 ardice of that people, who could calmly surren-  
 der into the hands of its inveterate enemy the  
 palladium of their freedom !

Instead then of basely giving up the outward  
 fort, let us nobly unite an ever-waking vigil-  
 ance with a loyal magnanimity, to defend the  
 citadel where happiness and liberty dwell, whose  
 capture must inevitably be attended with the  
 utter extermination, by a most cruel death, of  
 the lovers of order, religion, and peace.

These considerations constrain us to avow,  
 that even *had* a Parliamentary Reform been ne-

\* Cic. Orat. IV. in L. Catalinum.

*cessary,*

*cessary*, now that we behold our invaluable Constitution surrounded by deep waters and yawning gulfs, we should be terrified from sanctioning a measure which must inevitably plunge it into irremediable ruin.

To suppose that a modern House of Commons can display all the cold chastity of a *Wittenagenot*, is absurdly to imagine that, whilst all other sublunary things were naturally gliding into degeneracy, this alone could have preserved its primordial perfection:—an island of purity in an ocean of pravity. To believe that it could have remained untainted when the stream of corruption (in omne volubilis cœvum) was washing its shores, can be consistent only with the imagination of a visionary. It is affirmed, with a malignant audacity, that our political system is *thoroughly* on the decline. It should be recollected then, that, when a building uniformly sinks from its original height, all the component parts still preserve their primitive symmetry, and, consequently, that the harmony of the system is not impaired. Every thing is in its natural place and order. It is only by a material partial imperfection, by the rottenness  
of

of any principal beam, that the duration of the edifice is endangered. Evil cannot exist; however, without being felt. The only question then which concerns us, is, whether, with all these *seeming* defects, the Constitution is productive of practical good?—A question which every well-disposed Briton will joyfully answer in the affirmative. “O *knew* we but our happiness!!”

But it may be asked—Who are these spotless characters who are for hurling corruption out of the world, as Até was kicked out of Heaven? To fulminate anathemas against those vices which are inherent in human nature is scarcely tolerable even from the most pure and virtuous of mankind. Those philippics against luxury which might be compatible with the stoicism of a Pascal, would want something of propriety if indulged in by a disciple of Epicurus. Who are these crabbed and austere philosophers, then, who refuse to make allowances for human frailty? It is, in truth, matter of great doubt, whether these self-conceited puritans are preaching against corruption, from an unheard-of excess of defecated virtue, or from the cold malignity of blasted ambition. Who but the wildest speculatists



culatists would imagine, that a system of government could exist, in these degenerate times, perfectly free from the depravity of the age? Complaints of this kind are, indeed, rather libels on our nature, than charges against our national establishment. Immaculate fine-spun schemes of polity seem very plausible upon paper, but they are, from their nature, impracticable.

They may amuse the leisure of philosophers, but no sober man would seriously attempt, I believe, to carry them into practice. The Republic of Plato was probably faultless, but it was only a magnificent chimæra. The ingenious speculator Harrington might easily take care that no corrupt matter should be employed in the structure of his theoretic Commonwealth, but he would have found that "this fabric of a vision," when once attempted to be put into use, would instantly have vanished. The remark of Hume is, indeed, most just. It proceeds from consummate skill in the science of human nature.—

"The idea of a *perfect* and immortal Commonwealth will *always* be found as chimerical as that of a *perfect* and immortal man."

T

No

No man, who is not utterly ignorant of the nature of Republican Governments, will aver, that the best \*Democracy of which history has preserved any record can for an instant be compared with the Constitution of Great Britain. I know, indeed, that the fondness of change—the mutandarum rerum amor, is natural to man; and that the spirit of admiring the past at the expence of the present has been too much indulged even by enlightened men. There are men whose mischievous restlessness of temper prevents them from being content with the national system merely because it has become habitual: and because they are not indulged in all their malicious freaks to pull down the walls of a building within which they have enjoyed (and still may, if they chuse) the highest species of liberty, they are

\* It is, indeed, greatly doubted by profound politicians whether a *pure* Democracy has ever existed upon the earth: and this doubt is fortified by the declaration of a writer who, in his lucid intervals, occasionally delivered a valuable aphorism as an antidote to the mischief which his eloquent sophisms were naturally calculated to produce.—“S’il y avoit un Peuple de Dieux, il se gouverneroit démocratiquement. Un gouvernement si parfait *ne convient pas à des hommes.*”—Rouffeau du Contrat Social, tom. 2. chap. iv. Si sic omnia dixisset!

perpetually

perpetually proclaiming the superiority of republican politics; and ostentatiously trumpeting that the present form of Government is obnoxious to their dephlegmated and incorruptible purity. This may be a very good cloak to delude honest simplicity; but we cannot prevent ourselves from remembering, that the most stern and stiff-necked modern republicans have become, when they found it *convenient* or *profitable*, the most bland and pliable courtiers. Whoever reads, for instance, the political works of \*Milton cannot but be disgusted with the most servile and *unmerited* flattery, not to a Henry the Fourth, but to a most insolent usurper.

\* A more vile prostitution of talent cannot well be conceived, than that which displays itself in the following extract—

“Deseruimur, Cromuelle, tu solus superes, ad te summa  
 nostrarum rerum rediit, in TE SOLO consistit, insuperabili  
 tue virtuti cedimus cuncti, nemine vel obloquente, nisi  
 qui æquales inæqualis ipse honores sibi quærit, aut digniori concessos invidet, aut non intelligit nihil esse in societate hominum magis vel Deo gratum, vel rationi consentaneum, esse in civitate nihil æquius nihil utilius quam  
 potiri rerum dignissimum.”—Milton, Def. Secun. Pop. Anglic.

Though this illustrious scholar denied the right divine of Kings, he seems to have acknowledged the divine right of Usurpers in its utmost plenitude. Such a sentence, however creditable



per. Let us not, therefore, be deceived by the hypocrisy of their shallow doctrines.

We shall, perhaps, be ridiculed, as preferring to mope within the confines of an antiquated building, to being illuminated in repairing it, by those *new* and brilliant lights, which some of our countrymen so triumphantly proclaimed to be spreading in France to warm and cherish, by their genial influence, the torpid servitude of European nations; but which they now find have consumed the liberties of several deluded States, and have set almost all Europe in one general conflagration. We plead guilty to the charge. We frankly own, that we have ever been restrained from rashly admiring all immense plans of innovation from our firm belief in this simple truth—that the hand which cannot build a hut may demolish a palace. It was well remarked by a late profound politician, that “rage and phrenzy will pull down more in half an hour, than prudence, deliberation and fore-

ditable to the genius, is highly disgraceful to the high-bred principles of a man who prided himself in belonging to that school of sages who were “by ancient learning, to the enlightened love of ancient *freedom* warmed.”

“fight

"fight can build up in a hundred years."\*—We may be pardoned, therefore, for holding the opinion, that the awful task of altering a system formed of the collected wisdom of ages, even had a *necessity* for it been palpably *visible*, should not be approached in the perilous hour of inflamed licentiousness. Such a delicate, difficult and mysterious work should be entrusted only to men qualified by a well-known sober experience and consummate ability. It should not certainly be consigned to a gang of desperate, presumptuous, and ill-informed caballers.

Instead of wantonly plunging into this abyss of unparalleled danger, let us soberly ask ourselves—what is the *end* for which Governments are instituted? The *general good*—is the incontrovertible answer to this question. The proof of this is to be found in public freedom and happiness. If this *end* be obtained, it necessarily follows, that all discussions upon the superiority of one *form* of Government to another must be nugatory and dangerous; nugatory because they cannot possibly be productive of any real advantage, and dangerous because by in-

\* Mr. Burke's Reflections, page 248.

flaming causeless discontent and promoting polemical diffension, they infallibly generate infinite calamity. That this grand and glorious end is produced by the British Constitution is an irrefragable truth which the most frontless sophister will not, I trust, have the audacity to deny. *Spartam nactus es; hanc exorna* should, indeed, be the motto of every man.

Instead then of puzzling ourselves with subtle disquisitions on *ideal* liberty, let all our thoughts be employed in cherishing and protecting the *substantial* freedom we have long enjoyed; instead of fatiguing and bewildering our senses in mooted out metaphysic questions (which at *this* moment are peculiarly idle and mischievous)—whether evil is not sometimes to be tolerated in the *hope* of producing some good?—Which are the sure germs of kindling sedition—the destructive embryos of future revolution; let us refer them to the Greek Calends for a future discussion.

Even had I not experimentally known the real happiness which the British constitution diffuses; had I not felt the salutary freedom which

this



this glorious sun sheds on all within the benign influence of his rays, I do not think that I should have preferred the vague declamations of prattling sophisters, upon this most profound and momentous subject, to the opinions of Montesquieu, and all the great men since his day, who, after having "explored the vast extent of ages past," and impartially examined all the systems of government which the world has ever seen, found them all shrink in a comparison with our invaluable constitution. And shall we despise this most glorious composition of human wisdom *because* it exceeds (for I cannot conceive any other reason) all other terrestrial fabrics? Who but a maniac would wish to pluck the sun out of heaven because it is not immaculate? And if the production of the omnipotent hand is not spotless—can the offspring of human genius be rationally expected to be free from defect? It should rather be remembered with gratitude, that the beautiful polity which that master of political science Tacitus indulged himself in admiring, even in idea, we substantially and exclusively enjoy. It is a harmonious system which shines pre-eminently above all the democracies of antiquity, or the republics of modern annals.

By its powerful influence its component members, each in its own orbit, amicably control each other, and, by acting with an equable uniformity of motion, produce a happy co-operation, and diffuse true liberty and felicity upon all.—This is indeed a “Praise above all Greek, “above all Roman fame !” It is a system which approaches nearer to finished perfection than could possibly have been expected, had it not happily been known, to be compatible with the mixed and discordant principles of human society. Can Britons then, behold with apathy, and nourish by inattention, the wily serpent which is brooding in the fostering bowers of their country? Shall we calmly resign that constitution which has ever been the pride of Britain and the envy of the world ;—that constitution which was bought by the blood of our ancestors, and for which they cheerfully gave up their lives as a ransom, and, when they did so, left it an inestimable legacy to succeeding generations ; (the greatest blessing in the power of mortals to bequeath to their posterity) shall we calmly resign it, I ask, into the hands of the professors of Revolution—the well-known natural enemies of all regular governments? Shall

we

we tamely look on, and see a gang of wanton, furious desperadoes infuse into its vitals their morbidic poison, demolish all those external beauties which have raised it conspicuously pre-eminent above all the fabrics of mortality, destroy its innumerable and invaluable internal qualities which have caused it to become at once the envy and admiration of surrounding nations? Upon such a question, surely Britons will not be so hostile to themselves, and so treacherous to their posterity, as for an instant to refuse the unanimous negation; and with one hand and heart combine to defend their glory from the attack of its inglorious assailers, to protect its beauteous form from the rude polluted hands of its sanguinary ravishers. It is such a constitution, that, if I could, I would make it immortal.—I can only fervently pray **ESTO PERPETUA!**

Though storms and tempests thunder on its brow,  
And oceans break their billows at its feet,  
It stands unmov'd and glories in its height.

How would it vex the canonized spirits of our ancestors to learn, that the stupendous fabric, whose basis was laid in the hearts of their children, and whose pillars were cemented by their  
own



own blood, was now looked upon by a banditti of desperate adventurers, in the paroxysm of the fiercest licentiousness, as a desirable object of attack, as the subject they had chosen on which to try their hands at alteration ! How would such melancholy tidings disturb the awful stillness of the sepulchre, and wake from their peaceful sleep the tenants of the silent tomb !—

— Again for Britain's wrongs they feel,  
Again they snatch the gleamy steel,  
And wish th' avenging fight.—

It may be truly said, that of all the nations of the earth, none have been so peculiarly blessed with the kind auspices of divine bounty as this highly favoured island. We have risen to the acmè of power, splendor, and glory. Whatever we have, in wisdom, undertaken, the smiles of heavenly radiance have benignantly prospered : and hitherto success has crowned our undertakings. Shall we then, who have so long been in the enjoyment of so much distinguished partiality, who have so long possessed the essence of real liberty, suffer its citadel to be surrendered to a sanguinary tribe of rapacious ruffians, who would storm it with the combined force of rebellion, confiscation, and massacre ? Shall we  
quietly

quietly permit the frantic philosophers of revolt, with the sophistical and spurious rights of man in one hand, and a concealed dagger in the other, so to fascinate us from the free exercise of our rational faculties, as to dazzle and allure us by the false lights of the most shallow and presumptuous philosophy that was ever engendered by the wildest imagination of the most ill-starred maniac. Is reason to be driven from her sacred throne, to let these monsters of every vice usurp her dominion?—If we do not wish our country to vie with France in becoming a terrestrial pandemonium; let the most vigilant and strenuous exertions be employed to stem the rapid tide of innovation, which is about to flow in upon us, and which, if it be not opposed by the strong barrier of heroic loyalty, will inevitably overwhelm and demolish our peerless constitution.

The zealots of the new school of political philosophy, do not, like Archimedes, want a spot on which to fix their engines, but they want an *opportunity* (which our listless inattention, or be-fotted credulity will fully afford them) to turn the moral world into a chaos of ruinous anarchy.

The

The engine they have chosen for this most infernal design, is the abstract and metaphysic doctrine of natural \*right: which is admirably calculated for their purpose from the alluring smile by which it fascinates its converts, and from its real poisonous nature being far beyond the discernment of their consummate ignorance.—Like the miasms of pestilence they naturally imbibe it and quickly feel its baneful influence, but cannot discern whence it comes. This preposterous doctrine is at direct hostilities with the essence of regular government. It inculcates freedom of action in its utmost latitude, and consequently opens the gate to theft and murder.

\* The revolution in France is, no doubt, attributable to the levelling doctrines of philosophical free-thinkers; principally, perhaps, to the Social Contract of Rousseau. But in justice to genius, it must be owned, that they could have had no anticipation of the torture which their writings were to endure, to suit the caprice and purpose of the modern turbulent promoters of rebellion and atheism. Little did the romantic philosopher of Geneva dream, that those paradoxes which he was driven to fabricate in the ardour of contest, would have been construed into the fruit of serious meditation.—Little did he dream, that the offspring of his wit, launched as the sport of fancy and pride of genius, would have been blindly swallowed as the product of calm reflection, and of solid conviction.

As



As these apostles of sedition have, with a most fanatical industry, propagated their destructive tenets, a few words for the exposition of their fallacy, may not, perhaps, be thought totally extraneous.

By equality, it is meant by these radical reformers, that every man has a *natural* equal right to the riches of this world : and consequently is entitled to share, even by force, the wealth of his neighbour.

By liberty, these gentlemen would wish to be understood, the full right of obeying the dictates of their own will : and consequently of being totally exempt from the restraints of law.

To the first of these tenets it may be observed, that man, even in a state of *nature* does not possess the *equality* they wish to inculcate, since the superiority either of skill or of strength, forms an insurmountable barrier to the sovereignty of his will. Had this right of equality been naturally inherent in man, one man, in a savage state, would be entitled to a quiet possession of the hovel which was the product of his labour ;  
 should

should he be assailed, however, by an aggressor emboldened by a consciousness of superior strength, the rightful owner would soon find, that his right of equality (though fortified by the strong right of ownership which the law of *reason* proclaims to be the consequent of primitive possession) was merely ideal; and, that an appeal to it was too preposterous to be of service to him, even in a state totally free from the complicated interests of civilized periods. To adduce examples which expose the impotence of this theory were endless. But it must be evident, that all this clamour about the natural inprescriptible right of equality, is either the dream of a visionary, or the war-whoop of a conspirator.—What then is *true political equality*? An equal right to every man to be secure from the capricious and tyrannical dominion of his neighbour. In a state of nature this defence does not exist. It is to be found only in a compact of civil society. It is not to be denied, that this protection is afforded by the Constitution of England in unrivalled plenitude.

To the second dogma it may be replied, that though man, in a rude state, possesses the power  
of

of following the bent of his own inclination, still it is not totally free from controul : as it is ever subject to the restraint, and even castigation, of superior physical force. It must be obvious too, that in this state, man possesses less *liberty* than in a state of civil convention. By liberty is understood the unassailable enjoyment of possessions. Now, how can a man be said to enjoy the inviolable possession of his effects, who may have the very acorns which he has picked up at the foot of the oak, snatched from him with impunity, by a stronger savage ? Possessions which are hourly liable to be torn from him by the rude hand of lawless strength, must necessarily be more precarious and unstable than when protected by the immutable rules of justice : and liberty, which is exposed to every kind of injury, must consequently possess less essence and real value, than when covered by the shield of those sound laws which are established by the community for the public weal.

A state of nature is a state of licence ; but it is far different from a state of liberty. It is, indeed, diametrically opposite to it. As man, in a savage state, is perpetually exposed to the encroachment



croachment of superior power, either of neighbouring hordes, or of foreign invaders ; and as his single strength is utterly unable to stem such mighty torrents, his advancement in civilization points out to him the advantages arising from a social union. He consequently contributes, with the utmost cheerfulness, his stock of force and will, towards the panoply which alone can defend him from innumerable calamities. When he once enters, however, into this pact of society, he makes a complete abdication of his capricious will into the hands of the community for the common interest. To this sovereign power he virtually takes oaths of allegiance and fealty. He never can recover, (as long as the compact remains inviolate,) his former fundamental rights. He never can withdraw his primitive contribution, because it would not only be of no *real* advantage to him, but would directly tend to decompose the whole civil and political mass, and consequently would be hostile to the *general* good. Should the Convention, to which he was specially bound, be at any time dissolved, he then recovers his fundamental rights, and may remain, (if he chuses, to range like a Hottentot in all the luxury of

savage

savage freedom, to reign sovereign lord over his guts and garbage ; and, should they be seized by a ravenous and stronger barbarian, having no *earthly* power to which he can appeal for satisfaction, to tell his grievances to the unfeeling winds ;) in an individual and independent state. This sorry right he undeniably possesses. Whether it will be piously respected by the multitude, should they form themselves into a *new* civil society, it is not so very easy to divine.— But as long as the social compact preserves its unity, so long is he obliged to recognize the justice of its decrees, and to conform himself to its laws and ordinances. For, as the supreme law of all upright politics is the *general* good, this is never to be sacrificed to individual pleasure. And as commonwealths are *moral* essences, all attempts that he may make to gain his unlawful ends, will naturally be opposed by the commonwealth as fatal to its very existence.

If the power which a man resigned upon his entrance into society were revertible, it must be universally so : since no man possesses a greater right of recovery than another. The existence of civil society would then hang upon the nod

U

of

of caprice, and, in a short time, the commonwealth would inevitably dissolve in its own weakness. This awful danger, therefore, makes it absolutely necessary, that a man should be obliged to conform to the established laws of civilized society. This obedience is full of dignity. This service will be esteemed, when rightly understood, perfect \* freedom. If a man were allowed to follow the impulse of his own will, he would frequently act prejudicially to another; he would infringe upon the rights, and destroy the peace of his neighbour. Such conduct and a state of real liberty are a contradiction in terms. They are perfectly repugnant. For, if a state of liberty diffuses happiness and freedom to *all*, how can a man be said to be in full possession of these blessings, if he is in continual danger of being crushed by the preponderance of inimical strength? This state of liberty, or to speak more correctly, this state of licence, is a state of aphony. With what justice then can a man be called sovereign of his possessions, who is liable to have them assaulted, and who

\* *Mens et animus, et consilium, et sententia civitatis posita est in legibus. Hoc fundamentum est libertatis quâ fruimur, hic fons æquitatis. Legum denique idcirca omnes servi sumus ut liberi esse possimus. — Cic. pro Cluentio.*



is unable to apply for reparation to any established powerful judicature? It is, indeed, very discernable, that liberty itself may easily degenerate into the most grievous calamity. Unless this, which, abstractedly considered, is the greatest of blessings, be wisely managed; it may easily be perverted into a most dire curse. Is a maniac to be congratulated who may have escaped the protecting vigilance of his keepers, and, by that means may have recovered his original rights? It may be asked then—what is *true freedom*? I cannot answer this question so well as in the words of a writer who has defined this invaluable blessing with admirable exactness.—“Freedom is *not a liberty for every man to do what he lists*: But a liberty to dispose and order as he lists his person, actions, possessions, and his whole property, *within the ALLOWANCE of those laws under which he is.*”\*—This freedom we

\* Locke on Civil Government, chap. iii. § 57.—Let it not be imagined that, by citing this obviously incontestable declaration, I subscribe to the *general* political tenets of this great man. Like too many other philosophers, he rejects experience for theory. A conduct which, though it may perhaps procure a system temporary celebrity for ingenuity and novelty, will infallibly in the end prove disgraceful to the solid sense of its founder, and be productive of the most tremendous mischief to mankind.

possess. Instead then of suffering ourselves to be lulled into deadly security, by bewitching strains on false liberty, warbled from the throats of the incendiary Paine, and all the desperate choir of atheists, anarchists, and massacres, let us fly to the protection of our freedom from its inveterate enemies.

The zealots of anarchy have adopted the most subtle plan to gain their sanguinary ends, by inflaming the mind of deluded ignorance with the promise of enjoying, under the shade of the tree of liberty, all the peaceful sweets of the golden age. How I have smiled in agony at such brutish stupidity; but bled at the prospect of such deadly delusion! It should be engraved in letters of brass—that *their* \* tree of liberty is a tree, whose root is already saturated, and can be moistened by blood alone; whose branches distil the most deliterious poison; and whose fruit is the deadly apple of discord. This is truly the most refined and baneful machination that could possibly have been formed by the blackest and coldest malignity. These knights-errant in the crusade of rebellion, who are con-

\* “The tree of freedom is the British oak.”

tinually

tinually prostituting the sacred name of liberty, as the watch-word for the horrible subversion of empires, were strikingly described by the Roman historian—*Ut imperium evertant, libertatem præferunt; si perverterint, LIBERTATEM IPSAM aggredientur.*

These awful considerations imperiously demand the vigilance of courageous loyalty. When deeply laid conspiracies are formed between our domestic and foreign enemies to deluge our country with our blood, it is not surely the time to sleep upon our watch! When plots are designed by men infinitely more formidable than the Gracchi; men in comparison of whom Cataline was a loyalist, and Cethegus an austere moralist, virtue must feel herself roused by indignation, and will unite with valour, to crush them before they are matured into a strength too immense for resistance. It is worthy of the most serious reflection that the furious animal, who has long been watching an opportunity to attack us from abroad, is of a ferocity and magnitude hitherto unknown to the natural history of the world. He roars in a desert divided from our shores but by a narrow ri-



violet. He ranges in a territory, once smiling with prosperity and peace, but now converted, by his cruel nature and desolating influence, into a hideous, frightful wilderness; whose fields, so lately laughing in the pride of luxuriance, are now inundated with human gore. He enjoys, either by possession or by influence, the uncontrolled sway of a dominion nearly as extensive as Rome could boast even in her proudest days of glory, and though hailed by surrounding nations their imperial mistress. "Additur imperiis Hispania;"—"Jam tenet Italiam." His last and grandest work is the conquest of our nation; which effected, we shall groan in all the horrors of the most cruel slavery. Shall we then tamely submit to a disgrace which Britons scorned even in the iron age of Caractacus? Shall we, loaded with resources, cringe to an enemy inflated with the success with which cowardly or credulous nations have ignobly permitted his plans of confiscation and rapine to be crowned:—a baseness which was nobly despised by that rude but gallant warrior Cassivelaunus, cramped as he was in his exertions by the nakedness and poverty of infant Britain? Shall we sneak like base-born poltrons to a foe, who, in  
the

the moment of exultation and conquest, rendered ingloriously easy by the vile cowardice of surrounding states, has insolently proclaimed to us, that our destruction as an empire is necessary to his existence; and, with a view to frighten us into listless torpor and unresisting dread, has dared to assure us that his power is irresistible, and our subjugation unavoidable? This *fanfaronade* must equally excite our contempt, and rouse our indignation. The danger, indeed, is inevitable. Our only shield is co-operation. Party must be hurled from us as the spy and assistant of the enemy. When Hannibal is, almost at the gates, all private dissensions must finally cease, and all personal feuds be, for a time at least, forgotten. All discordant sounds of enmity must melt into a general harmony. All harsh din of jarring strife must soften into a perfect diapason of unanimity. All private opinions and abstract ideas of governments and of religion must be changed into one universal sentiment of rigorous opposition to an enemy, whose principles declare perpetual war to all regular governments, and to all systems of religion. All parties must imitate the conduct of two as great characters as the annals of anti-

quity boast.—When the Persians were preparing to invade Greece, the *different* \* *States*, of which Greece was composed, were *divided* in opinion who should preside over their maritime forces; the Spartans wished Eurybiades to be entrusted with the fleet, while the Athenians thought the command should devolve upon their illustrious Themistocles. But with that disinterestedness which is the characteristic of true patriotism, Themistocles (though naturally ambitious) conscious of the danger of disagreement at that critical moment, willingly resigned the command to Eurybiades. “This is not the time,” says he, “for the triumph of domestic feuds: let us forget all our animosities *during the war* with Persia.” To illustrate precept by example, he recalled his rival Aristides, who, by his sole influence, had been banished. This truly virtuous man, suffering no malice for past injury, nor jealousy of supreme power, to intrude themselves when the safety of his country was at stake; and “even his glory to his country’s weal submitting,” testified his ardent love of

\* This circumstance alone is sufficient to shew the weakness of *federal Governments* in times of difficulty and danger.

unanimity,



unanimity, by sailing from the island of Ægina through the Persian fleet, though at imminent personal peril, to inform Themistocles of the movement of the enemy. This cordial co-operation saved Greece: The formidable navy of Xerxes was utterly destroyed; and the names of these patriotic warriors and statesmen are immortalized by the battle of Salamis.

When Rome, too, was assailed by foreign violence, her noble sons did not permit themselves to be impeded by petty quarrel, or awed by intestine faction; but burying in oblivion all private altercations, they united into one invincible phalanx for the destruction of the common enemy. *Delenda est Carthago* was their war-song, which, from being known as the voice of pure unanimity and inflexible firmness, carried death into the thickest of the hostile ranks. Her conduct in the trying hour of war, by which she raised herself to the palmy state in which she once shone, is thus described with elegant perspicuity by the historian, for the example and imitation of unborn ages.—*Majores nostri, cum bellis asperrimis premerentur, equis, viris, pecuniâ, nunquam defessi sunt armati de imperio certare. Non inopia ærarii, non vis hostium,*

hostium, non adversa res, ingentem eorum animum subegit; quin, *quæ virtute ceperant, simul cum animâ retinerent.* Atque ea magis fortibus consiliis, quam bonis præliis, patrata sunt. *Quippe apud illos UNA RESPUBLICA erat; Ei omnes consulebant; Factio contra hostes parabatur; Corpus atque ingenium patriæ, non suæ potentiae, quisque exercitabat.\**

If cordial unanimity and real spirited co-operation, suitable to the patriotic dignity, and congenial with the magnanimous temper of the British character be now employed, for the preservation of ourselves as a nation, and for the security of the whole civilized world;—where is the man who will dread the consequence? When was the time known that united Britons, even with inferior strength, did not rise superior to the assault of the most tremendous enemy? What real hopes of success, then, may we reasonably entertain from the prosecution of a contest, in which we are aided by a fund of resources unequalled in the annals of the British history:—resources springing from finances, not only unimpaired, but superabundant and plethorick, and fully adequate, with

\* Sallust. Orat. 2. de Repub. Ordinanda.

skilful management, to the most heavy and extensive occasions.

But to explore the intricate mazes of the financial labyrinth, is a herculean task, to perform which, were I willing I should be unable, and were I able I should be unwilling. The examination of our resources is a topic which has been so repeatedly and so ably treated, that little remains to be discovered even by the most dexterous arithmeticians. From their successful labours we derive the exhilarating intelligence, that, notwithstanding the demands of a war of an unprecedented expence, the physical strength of our country is, not only not diminished, but greatly augmented. This is an animating truth, which is clearly visible to those who wish to see things as they really are, and which is denied by those alone whose contracted and malicious minds impel them to depreciate and calumniate the sources of our power, with what horrid views it is painful to repeat.

I know that the obsequies of our national resources have been sung by those birds of evil presage, who are incessantly croaking their dull and



and mournful notes to palsy our exertions. But it is to be observed, that their harsh tunes, though they cannot fail to grate our ears, should not be suffered to stupify our heads and petrify our hearts. We should oppose to their unsupported assertions, documents which firmly rest upon the rock of truth. From these we find, that the produce of the taxes upon articles of luxurious use, during the war, have fully equalled the produce of the same during an equal number of preceding years of peace :\* which clearly proves, that if luxury is able to indulge herself in her utmost refinement, and profusion, the melancholy tidings of the distresses of the country, which are, with such malignant industry, proclaimed by the bellowers of sedition, must necessarily be fallacious and execrable ; and naturally gives rise to the reflection, that if, in the trying hour of war, the national reservoir of wealth is so exuberant, how may we not expect it to overflow in the halcyon days of peace.

It will be urged, perhaps, that this comparison is applicable only to the higher orders of

\* Vide the Reports of the Finance Committee of the House of Commons, in 1791 and 1797.

society :

society : but it is to be remembered, that the number of the lower class of our countrymen is universally allowed not to have diminished ; that the rates of their wages have been greatly increased almost throughout the kingdom ; and that the most scrupulous care has been taken, that the taxes raised for the necessities of the war should completely fly over their heads.

The state of our export trade, the true unerring criterion of prosperity or adversity, is undeniably proved to be flourishing in the extreme. " It appears," says the Report of the Secret Committee of the Lords, " by the account of " the value of imports and exports for the last " twenty years, produced by Mr. Irving, that " the demand for cash to be sent abroad, was " greatly compensated by a very large balance " of commerce in favor of this kingdom ; *greater* " *than was ever known in any preceding period.* " The value of the exports of the last year " (1796) amounted, according to the valuation " on which the accounts of the Inspector General are founded, to 30,424,184 l.\*—which " is

\* The value of British and foreign merchandize exported in 1797, amounted to 29,217,041 l.---Our exports in 1798,

" is *more than double*, what it was in any year  
 " of the American war, and *one-third more than*  
 " it was on an average during the last peace.  
 " previous to the year 1792; and though the  
 " value of the imports to this country has, dur-  
 " ing the same peace, greatly encreased, the  
 " *excess* of the value of the exports above that  
 " of the imports, which *constitutes the balance of*  
 " *trade*, has *augmented* even in a greater pro-  
 " portion."

I have brought forward these few but incon-  
 testable proofs, merely to expose and refute the  
 false and gloomy tidings heaved from their very  
 midriff, by disappointed pride and malignant se-  
 dition, in the hope of stunting the vigorous ef-  
 forts of their country, and consequently to see  
 her fall into the jaws of a devouring foe. How  
 animating must it be to the hearts of Britons to  
 reflect that, in addition to these vast resources,  
 they have a navy transcendently superior to any  
 which the ocean ever saw, and manned by he-  
 as far as can be judged from the three first quarters, (being  
 as late as the account can as yet be made up to) were still  
 more considerable. For this information I am indebted to  
 Lord Auckland's published speech, delivered in the House  
 of Peers the 8th of January, 1799.



roes who "bear Britannia's name in thunder  
 "round the world;"—a navy which, at this  
 moment, amounts to \*200 ships of the line,  
 a navy whose banners soar in towering majesty  
 in every quarter of the globe, and whose match-  
 less prowess has so crippled the maritime power  
 of our enemies that its approach is anxiously  
 shunned by conscious † inferiority; and is strik-  
 ingly contrasted by the ruined naval force of  
 our united enemies, which has long been trem-  
 bling at our strength and lurking in their ports;  
 (it stole, indeed, lately from its hiding place—  
 but only to be vanquished;) a navy which has,  
 in the course of the present war, covered itself  
 with laurels which no time can tarnish, and im-  
 mortalized itself by more brilliant and important  
 victories than ever graced the naval annals of  
 even Great Britain. It now triumphantly rides  
 the waves of glory! How is this noble and  
 inspiring reflection heightened by the know-  
 ledge, that to this invincible and peerless navy,

\* In the course of the war we have captured from our  
 united enemies nearly 400 ships of war, of all descriptions,  
 independent of privateers.

† *Non illi imperium pelagi, regnumque tridentis*  
*Sed mibi forte datum*——  
 —may, indeed, be the characteristic motto of Great Britain.  
 The confession of it is even extorted from our enemies.

the

the most complete and best appointed military establishment that Britain could ever boast, has united itself in proud but amicable rivalry, for her protection from foreign invasion and domestic faction. The memorable conduct of the army in disdaining the insidious allurements of industrious treason, and in redoubling its saving vigilance and inflexible firmness, at a most alarming crisis, has laid strong claims to our admiration and gratitude; and has shewn what unbounded reliance can be placed on British soldiers in the trying hour of calamitous emergency.

But in addition to these invaluable acquisitions, we possess resources, flowing from a copious and salient spring of British valor and British generosity, branching out into the innumerable streams of voluntary service, but having their confluence, in one common channel, in spite of the puny barriers of baffled sedition, for one grand and important object—national defence.

The unspeakable advantage of this well-timed energetic alliance of inflexible loyalty and daunt-

less

less courage has been already felt. To their honourable exertions Great Britain is indebted for her protection from an intended and prepared invasion. At that awful moment, when the gigantic foe, proud in the greatness of collected strength, and inflamed with the confidence of instant victory, was rising to crush the British throne, the terrific glare of innumerable spears advancing to the protection of our laws, our liberties, our Father and our King, smote the tyrant to the earth: appalled and vanquished by the glorious sight, he fell vomiting flames of wrath, and impotent vaunts of destruction and death. There "gnashing for anguish," and "waiting revenge," the huge monster lies, confounded but not destroyed, bruised by the mighty fall; but when healed by our listless torpor, and when nourished by our inattention into pristine vigour, he is to watch the moment our vigilance sleeps, to crown his second effort with success. Never did the Crown of Britain shine with such transcendant lustre; never was her towering majesty seen so conspicuously pre-eminent, as upon that proud morning when every the smallest hamlet spontaneously gave from her bosom her stock of strength and valour



towards the structure of the impenetrable shield which alone can defend her. Thanks to the tutelary genius of Great Britain the glories of that memorable day have not set! The talisman of self-preservation is still in our hands; nothing but a most criminal disdain of its virtue can render it ineffectual.

Blest with these stupendous resources, let our first sacred office be to exorcise the foul demon disaffection, and to invoke that ancient spirit of heroic hardihood, for which Britons have ever been transcendantly renowned. Let us then rally round the standard of freedom reared by our Sovereign and Protector: let us lay these unequalled resources at the feet of the throne, and implore a Monarch, whose paternal virtues have justly endeared him to the affection of a grateful, generous, valorous, though sometimes too credulous, people, to employ them for the preservation of the common interest. We should never forget that the wars of that Monarch, who now holds, with glory to himself, and happiness to his subjects, the British sceptre, have never sprung from motives of wanton hostility or personal ambition; they have not, like those

those of Louis the Fourteenth, or Frederick the Great, wantonly laid waste flourishing provinces, and in the sport of rapine, wrung agonizing tears from widows and from orphans. The wars, in which he has, contrary to his philanthropic and peaceful nature, been unfortunately engaged, have originated in principles which treason *must* revere, though she *may* oppose. We should remember, that the Prince who now rules these realms, though he may not have equalled the House of Medici in the protection of the arts and sciences, has nursed them with a fostering tenderness, hitherto unknown to the House of Hanover. We should gratefully reflect, that an ever-waking vigilance for the interests, and an invariable regard for the happiness, of his people, have ever been the systematic characteristics of his conduct.—Of such a Prince it may be truly said (what was falsely affirmed of a Roman Emperor) *nil ortitutum alias nil ortum tale fatentes!* We should remember, that the unsullied dignity of the Crown, is the keystone which binds the arch of our brave Constitution. We should reflect that, if one member of that beautiful and well-ordered system be impaired and defaced, the whole

whole body must inevitably perish: that, if one pillar of the august fabric—the trijunction in uno, whose maffy doric is honest labor, and whose more polished Corinthian capital is refinement in science and in art, be defiled or undermined, that symmetrized and concatenated edifice will instantly shrink from its foundation, and crush its unhallowed polluters with its gigantic ruins. The temple of liberty will then be converted into the sty of barbarism, and into the den of murderous anarchy. These considerations should attract us to one point of union; our scattered forces should be concentrated and placed in the protecting hands of royalty. It must not be forgot, however, that the instruments of power and greatness which we happily possess, must ever be kept tempered by unabating perseverance, and sharpened by courageous vigilance. Great and unparalleled as they are, they have not the faculty of lasting for ever unimpaired by use. It is their nature to decrease by service, and it is our duty to augment them by diligence. It is the indispensable duty of every man to give up personal gratification, and to submit to a temporary inconvenience, for the  
fake



sake of increasing the national strength.\* The lust of selfish profit must be changed into a passion for the general good.† Their effects will be marred by any ill-timed niggardness, and totally frustrated by frigid indifference. It has been proved by experience, that parsimony in war is but a petty and short-sighted virtue, which, though it may produce temporary ease, must, in the end, infallibly generate universal distress. By procrastinating to the evil hour of unsuspicious indolence all great efforts to avert the formidable and growing danger, momentary quiet is punished by perpetual and unalterable misery. It would ill become a nation like this, which has been so long gamboling in a sea of luxurious ease and plenty, to repine at the temporary resignation of them, for future preserva-

\* It is not unworthy of remark that the Gauls were so dreaded by the Romans, that in the *lex de vacatione*, which exempted the Roman Citizens from military service, this clause was inserted—*nisi bellum Gallicum exoriat*; in which case the very priests were obliged to take up arms in defence of their country. The existence of this perilous crisis certainly demands a similar suspension of privilege.

† Virbonus et sapiens, et legibus parens, et civilis officii non ignarus, *utilitati omnium plus quam unius, alicujus aut suæ consulit.*—Cic. de fin.

tion against the inroads of a ferocious enemy, has no other source of existence than war and universal plunder.

If we are firmly resolved to sacrifice at the high altar of unanimity these trifling superfluities, we have little to fear from an enemy, whose strength, when analyzed, will be found to be rather the struggle of insanity, than the firm, steady force of deliberative courage; whose continental conquests have proceeded, not from rare heroism or transcendent skill, but from a torpid security, or trembling, groveling cowardice on the part of her feeble antagonists, whose achievements have sprung from the collected force of innumerable swarms of *deluded enthusiasts*, rushing like a torrent upon very inferior

\* I will not suffer my indignation to restrain the confession, that history, in recording the *continental* successes of France, may proclaim (if, in the prosecution of the conflict, the tide of prosperity, now happily turned against her, does not leave her stranded upon the shoals of despair) "*Gallus in bellis floruisse*,"\* but truth obliges me to own, that the sequel of the sentence is not to be omitted, as it is strikingly descriptive of the state of modern France "*mox regnities cum otio intravit, amissa virtute, pariter ac Libertate.*"

The continental successes of France have proceeded from a wild waste of men, and a small number of soldiers, armed with the most powerful arms, and the most numerous armies;

armies, or upon a few peaceable inhabitants, whose courage and loyalty were preparatively sapped by the insidious arts of their subtle and treacherous foe.

Fanaticism may certainly be a very useful instrument in the hands of wily policy, and may produce a temporary fierceness for the blind encounter of dangers, from which rational and systematic valour might probably shrink: but this brittle engine will ever crumble in the grasp of vigorous attack. This rank and unnatural passion has been incessantly nourished too by that licentiousness of plunder, in which the Gallic freebooters have invariably rioted. Like other epidemic distempers of the mind, however, it is in its nature short-lived. The enthusiastic multitude, who followed the banner of Peter the Hermit, were, at their first onset, irresistible: but the furious malady which nerved their arm, soon subsided into a languor incapable of standing against the shock of cool and undaunted strength. It must be owned, indeed, that the fever of fanaticism which has so long raged in

\* The continental successes of France have proceeded from a wild waste of more than *thrice* the number of soldiers than all the allied powers put together.



France has almost entirely left her; it has been succeeded, however, by a more destructive spirit of wanton plunder and rapine,—which is fed solely upon the very vitals of all well-ordered States. This source of power, indeed, now seems to be rapidly ebbing. The continent of Europe, at length goaded into courage, will no longer suffer its members to be immolated at the shrine of Moloch.

The annihilation of the *fiscal* power of France has, I am aware, long been predicted, and the supposed fallacy of these predictions has been, among certain classes of our countrymen, the subject of considerable ridicule. Let it not, however, be supposed that these prophecies are fallacious, and that the triumph is built upon a rock.—The last gasp of *national* *fisc* has long since taken place. But this circumstance, (the very apprehension of which has produced the dissolution of former States,) could not certainly be expected to cause instant death to a nation, which has most ingeniously discovered the art of existing without (what has hitherto been thought the vital principle of States) a revenue. Though this loss has not, as yet, been productive of fatal consequence, it undeniably has an infallible, though

though negative tendency to diminish her strength, and to increase her miseries. It drove her, in the paroxysm of desperation, to the horrible necessity of devouring her own children.—

This system of cannibalism, in conjunction with the plunder of unoffending nations, have been the sole means by which she has been enabled to persist in this unprecedented struggle. It never could have entered the imagination of man, that a nation, professing herself to be the parent of philanthropy, could be so sunk in cruelty as (in exact imitation of the barbarian Huns of the middle ages) to ravage and lay waste peaceable and neutral countries to feed upon their mangled carcases. It was not to be anticipated, that she could so frequently satiate her ravening appetite with the miserable pittance of the groaning peasant, wrung from him with blood by the cruel gripe of an unnatural parent. It was not to be prognosticated by the wildest speculatist, that a nation, boasting herself the patroness of universal benevolence, and calling her residence the citadel of freedom, could have surpassed in atrocity the Syracusan tyrant Agathocles, and, like him, have assembled, with the calmest apathy, the people in one vast croud, in order, with more facility

facility by one stroke, to get rid of every opposition, and to seize upon their wealth. Much less was it to be imagined that any set of wretches could have quietly stood to be hacked in pieces. Her advocates may probably attempt to palliate this brutality, as the stern call of rigid necessity; but they will not affirm that these resources can, owing to their very nature, be other than short-lived. These fountains must soon become dry when the springs by which they are fed are exhausted. Sober reason and calm reflection will soon resume their sway in the mind of the French nation; she will contemplate that she has long groaned under the most odious vassalage, to pamper the cruel ambition of five sanguinary usurpers. She will blush at the thought of her being so long deluded and amused by the toys of pretended liberty and equality; liberty realized by the most galling slavery; and equality proved by an equality only of wretchedness. Her armies will not long submit to be the janissaries of a bench of insatiate and remorseless tyrants; when the plunder, by which they have been instigated, is no longer at hand: they will not long fatten upon paper. We now find, indeed, the volcano no longer able to vomit her lava of compulsory



compulsory paper : It seems to have disgorged itself of those badges of bankruptcy and beggary, which have enabled France to riot in uninterrupted atrocities. Panick-struck at these dreadful considerations, she turns her eye in despair to the usual sources of power,—and beholds the wretched spectacle of her population dwindled ; her colonies captured ; her industry languishing ; her manufactures decayed ; and her commerce annihilated. In addition to these unspeakable miseries she bends under the iron rod of a Government which allows life and death to be in the hands of a few unfeeling despots.

Exertions arising from the tolerance of the most distressing exactions, and from the denial of the bare comforts of an existence which hangs upon the nod of capricious tyranny, cannot certainly be expected long from a people, accustomed to the elegant luxuries of polished life, but now suddenly reduced to servile and galling obedience to a sanguinary government :—a people now degraded to a state of the most despicable political *helotism*.

To enter, however, into a minute description of that nameless combination of miseries and crimes,

crimes, under which France is now bleeding, and which is dignified by the title of the French Republic, would be a mere waste of time, as it is totally foreign to the purpose of these pages.—I cannot, however, abstain from observing, that the name of *Republic*, which is constantly and artfully employed to adorn that hideous system, is the most egregious misnomer that can possibly exist. If that word be considered either etymologically or historically, its claims to that distinction will be found to be spurious and absurd. It is similar to none of the republics of the antique world ; it is perfectly different from any that have flourished in modern annals. It is, indeed, completely *idiosyncratic*. At the murder of the French Monarchy, the first kind of government which sprung up was a most wild ochlocracy, which, being the triumph of the capricious rabble, was, from its nature, short-lived. It was soon slain. Out of its tomb, however, has arisen the most cruel and ferocious \*oligarchy that was ever permitted to scourge the human

\* It was the boast of the Athenian legislator, that he had accomplished his system of laws by the happy association of justice\* and strength. But the Gallican sages may vaunt that they have surpassed him in the simplicity of their system,

\* Plutarch vit. Solonis.

since

human race, and to bind mortality captive.—  
It exercises a wantonness of despotism unparalleled in the annals of human depravity.

To  
since they have had the dexterity to build a code of *strength alone*, and in which justice would have been a most obtruding and obnoxious ingredient.—A code whose fulcrum is injustice, and whose rude, powerful lever is sanguinary physical force; as for *Justitiæ foror fides*, she is converted into the foulest perfidy—her sister has lost her celestial attributes; both have been metamorphosed into the daughters of Acheron and Nox. When I reflect that a population of twenty-four millions of men suffers itself to be tyrannized over by this brutal code, I blush for the vile degradation to which humanity can reduce itself. When I reflect that it is in the power of a handful of men, who, by covering themselves with the panoply of all vice, have hitherto reigned unmo-  
lest in the usurpation of unbounded dominion, I am ready to supplicate heaven to rain down curses upon such finished villainy. This code has arisen from the ashes of that very composition, (now no more respected by them than the institutes of the Thalmud or the Koran) whose holy voice was so triumphantly boasted, by the Solons and Numas of France, to speak the sacred mandates of nature, of reason, and of justice.—It is a code, in comparison of which that of Draco was written with the milk of pure philanthropy; and which has for its principal and leading feature—that  
† punishment be inflicted prior to the examination of alleged guilt. This *bellish* justice had full scope to glut its rapacious appetite with the bodies of the most moderate of the upstart junto, with Barthélemi at their head, who, upon

† Gnosius hæc Rhadamanthus habet durissima regna  
*Castigatque, auditque dolos, subegitque fateri.*

a ground-



To speculate however upon the probable permanency of this pestiferous dynasty would ill become the inexperience of the present writer.

In a groundless accusation, and deprived of the lawful privilege of trial, were hurled to the scorching deserts of Cayenne. Thus were the most unoffending persecuted with a more cruel rigor than is ordained by the laws of civilized States for the most turbulent and atrocious. This was, however, natural. Power which has been wrenched by usurpation from its rightful possessor, was never known to be employed but in the commission of crimes.—*Nemo unquam imperium flagitio acquisitum bonis artibus exercuit.* Such refinement in flagitiousness cannot but give birth to the reflection, that men who can exercise such execrable cruelties sink below fiends in wickedness, and men who can suffer them below idiots in folly.

“Les Loix,” says M. Montesquieu “qui font perir un homme sur la déposition d’un seul témoin, sont fatales à la liberté. La raison en exige deux ; parce qu’un témoin qui approuve, et un accusé qui nie, font un partage ; et il faut un tiers pour les vider. Les Grecs et les Romains exigeoient une voix de plus pour condamner. Nos loix Françaises en demandent deux. Les Grecs pretendoient que leur usage avoit été établi par les Dieux ; mais c’est le Notre.”—l’Esprit de Loix, lxi. c. 3.---If it be true then, that the deposition of but one witness is an authority so insufficient upon the awful question of life or death, as to amount to a destruction of real freedom :—What would this profound Legislator, (who, I think, is

\* Nul ne peut être jugé qu’après avoir été entendu où légalement appelé.—Const. Franc. Art. xi. I mention this merely to shew what reverence is paid to French Laws.

In the boundless field of political prediction, it may be remembered, veteran sagacity has been deluded and lost. It may perhaps be observed, without any pretension to shrewdness, that no Government has any claim to excellence, that does not possess the happy power of commanding spontaneous affection and veneration : and that that Government which inspires its subjects with no other sentiments than those of terror and hatred, cannot be rationally supposed to possess any intrinsic beauty or merit. To suppose then, that a Government, which has not the inherent power of influencing even obedience without the aid of violence, and which finds itself obliged to enforce law by the point of the bayonet, can be cherished and beloved by the people, were a most flagrant absurdity.

nearly equal to any modern Publicist) now say of his altered countrymen--the apostles of revolutionary freedom, who instantly pass judgment of death, disdaining the trouble of examining even one witness? What would he think, too, of his embruted countrymen, who can quietly sink into such polluted slavery? And yet these miscreants have the profane effrontery to proclaim that the air of liberty is breathed in France!

\* The ingenious and learned author of *Oceana* published a demonstration of the impossibility of restoring Monarchy in England, a few months only before the restoration of Charles the Second.

And

And to expect (after the proof it has so lately given us,) that a furious nation, not yet recovered from the paroxysm of revolution, will for any length of time tamely drag on a miserable and precarious existence, and submit to a despotism, compared with which their old government (the theme of much unmerited obloquy) was one of the mildest and most lenient polities which have ever flourished in the world, would be, I think, equally preposterous. Imprisoned grievances will burst forth with the impetuosity of a torrent and will easily tear down the puny barriers that can be opposed against them. I shall merely remark, that the low, hollow murmur, ominous of convulsion, which is so often heard to grumble in the bowels of France, cannot be deemed auspicious to the longevity of the Constitution, and, that that system of Government which feels its foundation shaken by the lightest gust of popular violence, and whose fabric may be utterly demolished by an ephemeral commotion, or by the buffle of one tempestuous day, cannot certainly be said to have any claim to the venerable title of prospective durability.

Exertions



Exertions to aid the designs of such a Government, may for a time be extorted, but cannot be spontaneously bestowed. The rooted disaffection which this horrific system must naturally generate, is hostile to the success of their destructive views, and loudly admonishes us to persevere with redoubled energy in this momentous conflict. Peace, at this time, would be of all things the most calamitous. To court the sweets of friendship from an enemy whose rancour is at its highest pitch, would be nothing less, than to be blindly fascinated with his sardonic smile, and to rush unarmed into his deadly grasp. To expect it were insanity. It would be, indeed, the commission of political suicide. The moment is too serious for duplicity;—to conceal the truth would be, not pious fraud, but criminal treachery.—It must be frankly declared, that peace never can be *securely* made with France, whilst the principles, by which she is nourished, flourish in such strong and rank luxuriance. They are, by nature, at war with the whole civilized world. They keep alive a perpetual conspiracy in every State. They proclaim incessant hostility to all religion, order, liberty, and peace. Time was, when such a

Y

declaration

declaration might, perhaps, have been ridiculed  
 by that tribe of vulgar politicians, whose short-  
 sighted views are bounded by the considera-  
 tion of the passing moment; but alas! the  
 groans of too many enslaved countries loudly  
 attest the truth of it. To call that *peace* which  
 wears the characteristics of the most ferocious  
 war is really a mockery in language. The Gal-  
 lican system and peace is a preposterous solecism.  
 It must be obvious then, that as long as these  
 baneful principles are prevalent, war is inevita-  
 ble. No Englishman will betray the villainous  
 turpitude to declare his preference of an ignomi-  
 nious and insecure peace, to a just, necessary, and  
 honourable war. No Briton will say *iniquissi-  
 mam pacem justissima bello antefero*.—Such a  
 confession would brand his name with eternal  
 infamy. Experience has, indeed, abundantly  
 shewn the insanity of the supposition, that any  
 agreement deserving the name of peace can be  
 settled with a system whose very essence is war.  
 The most advantageous fruit which our vile  
 prayers for conciliation could produce would be  
 non *pax*, sed *pactio servitutis*. It is evident,  
 therefore, that these principles must be crushed  
 if the christian world is ever to be restored to  
 harmony

harmony and peace. It will be said, perhaps, that to war with principles is useless.—And the opinions probably of Grotius or of Thuanus will be urged, with a mistaken triumph, in support of such an assertion. The cases are, however, by no means analogous. Religious phrenzy, (the omnipotence of which these wise and virtuous men declare) is strengthened by opposition: Atheistic and anarchic zeal must be weakened by it. The votaries to Religion, feeling it to be indispensably necessary to their well-being and happiness in this life, and animated by the hope of enjoying the reward of their sacred heroism in another world, brave every difficulty and danger to protect that form of religion which they deem, in the delirium of their zeal, almost equivalent to the blessing itself: the slaves of atheism and anarchy cannot love a system which forces them to drag on life without comfort, and which teaches them to contemplate death without hope; and will not shield with their bodies the natural object of their hatred, for the sole sake of protecting five bloody ruffians on the throne of usurpation, built upon the mangled carcase of the general freedom. The all-powerful voice of nature will therefore urge

harmony

Y 2

them



them to assist, (when they think the moment  
 auspicious) not oppose, a force which aims solely  
 at the annihilation of their tyranny.

So far then from imploring peace ourselves,  
 should it even be solicited by France (for such a  
 circumstance is certainly within the range of  
 probability) we must reflect, that the mind of  
 France has long been screwed up, by the iron  
 hand of her despotic and insatiated usurpers, to  
 the last pitch of misery; and that a dread of its  
 bursting into vengeance can alone instigate her  
 horrid tyrants to try to renovate their strength  
 by the fallow of a peace: on this account, there-  
 fore, such a solicitation must instantly be re-  
 fused.

I may be permitted, perhaps, to give it as my  
 most decided opinion, that the repeated failures  
 of our earnest endeavours to re-establish peace  
 are proved by experience to have been eventually  
 highly fortunate. Fervently as I must revere  
 that spirit of benevolence which abhors the con-  
 tinuance of war, and highly as I must admire  
 the self-evident *sincerity* of those wishes to re-  
 store tranquillity, I must still candidly confess,

that

that the state of hostility, in which we now find ourselves, is much more likely to procure us in the end *permanent* happiness, than a peace granted to us by the enemy as an allurement to our destruction. Awful experience has demonstrated, that the listless security which is ever the concomitant of peace, has been the infallible instrument in the hand of France by which she has completed the destruction of every deluded nation. The miscarriage of our pacific attempts was our saviour. In the grand carnival of human life the strangest variety of eccentricities occurs. Those crosses in our views, which to day cause distracting sorrow, a few months may clearly prove to have been the salvation of our happiness, and even of our existence. Instead then of ignobly supplicating peace, we must wield the sword of war with tenfold fury. We are not to confine ourselves to defensive measures. We are absolved from this exclusive duty by the unexampled strength of our \* navy, which

Not being conversant in the language of panegyric, I shall not attempt to do justice to the indefatigable exertions of Lord Spencer. His highest eulogy is derivable from the knowledge, that sedition herself, though the defects, cannot conceal his admiration of his patriotic vigour and energy.

which not only so effectually protects our shores that we may laugh at the threats of invasion, but has caused the triumphant name of Great Britain to be dreaded, honoured, and revered from the mouth of the Thames to the banks of the Nile: it affords us a favorable opportunity to aid Europe in hurling destruction on the common foe. It must be owned, indeed, that our scheme of warfare has hitherto been too narrow and contracted. We have confined our exertions too much to the *coasting*, we have not sufficiently plunged into the *ocean* of war. Our plans have been too much of a defensive nature. The dreadful but undeniable truth, that our Constitution and the liborticide Government of the enemy, with whom we have to contend, cannot co-exist, should ever have been present to our energy. His conduct has, indeed, great claims upon the gratitude of his country. She not only sees, under his auspices, her commerce protected, but beholds her naval glory exalted to an unparalleled height, and her proud fleets returning from every quarter of the globe, loaded with the trophies of well-earned victory.

\* "He who freely magnifies what has been nobly done, and fears not to declare as freely what might have been done, better gives you the best covenant of his fidelity. His highest praise is not flattery, and his plainest advice is praise."—Milton's *Areopagitica*.

minds:



minds. Our efforts, therefore, should have been  
 offensive. We should have struck at the root  
 of the evil. Instead of confining our exertions  
 merely to ward off formidable blows, they should  
 have been strenuously employed in crushing the  
 arm which inflicted them. We should un-  
 dauntedly have carried the thunder of war into  
 the thickest of the hostile ranks. This error  
 has not been peculiarly ours; it betrayed  
 all the coalesced powers. This fundamental  
 error, added to an exclusive attention, on the  
 part of our perfidious allies, to personal and mo-  
 mentary interest, has been to some the source  
 of, I fear, irreparable ruin.—This was the great  
 "serbonian bog," "where armies whole have  
 sunk." The European Courts should have  
 reflected, that individual profit could not be  
 acquired but by general calamity; and that  
 general calamity must necessarily include in-  
 dividual distress. There was no intermediate  
 ground on which they could rest. The only  
 alternative from general disaster was, not a  
 nominal and ideal confederacy, for selfish views,  
 but a confederacy whose soul was indissoluble  
 firmness and dauntless ardor, exerting itself for  
 the noble and heroic purpose of preserving Eu-

rope from the domination of principled reg-  
 icides, and atheistic plunderers. From their  
 short-sighted policy let us derive an invaluable  
 lesson. We have seen the rock upon which  
 they split. The example which their self-hostile  
 conduct has afforded us, is not, indeed, of ex-  
 clusive advantage to us; it is universally useful.  
 The European powers, which did not join this  
 shadowy confederacy may avail themselves of the  
 momentous instruction which is placed before  
 their eyes, and may avoid a similar fate.  
 I am indeed most firmly of opinion, that our  
 hopes of final success wear an infinitely more  
 smiling aspect, and may be more rationally en-  
 tertained, at this moment, than at the com-  
 mencement of this unfortunate coalition. Igno-  
 rance of the real danger, added to delusion  
 by the enchanting promises of France, was the  
 incurable ruin to some, and the source of dis-  
 tress to all. Knowledge of the deep designs of  
 the rancorous foe, may inspire all who are yet  
 independent to protect themselves against the  
 traitorous professions of amity, (which have been  
 the invariable weapon by which she has gained  
 an opportunity of poisoning with her principles

to many States;) and will rouse deluded countries to burst with spirit the shackles by which they are debased; and to enter with revengeful fury into an alliance against the sanguinary and execrable scourge of nations and of mankind. Great Britain alone saw from the beginning the nature of the danger. Whilst jacobinism, having rocked almost all Europe asleep in the arms of death, was advancing with giant strides to desolate this happy country, GREAT BRITAIN, (destined seemingly by Heaven to be the saviour of the civilized world!) single and alone, undaunted by the magnitude and fierceness of the hideous, hell-born fiend, by the boldness and dexterity of her attacks, not only maimed and checked the "enemy of mankind," but happily roused Europe from her deadly slumbers. Europe has beheld, by dear bought experience, France, who boasted herself the tutelar goddess of all oppressed countries, soon throw off the mask and display herself in her natural character, as a destroying angel scattering plagues and desolation upon credulous nations. She has awaked from her torpor, and will shake off her delusion; she will hurl the thunder of her vengeance upon the murderer of her peace. Europe



rope may now see, that France is not at war  
 with any particular potentate, that her object is  
 the subversion of every civilized State. She will  
 reflect, therefore, that nothing but a general  
 alliance can save her; an alliance into which we  
 must either enter with heroic fervor, or perish.  
 Were not the danger which hangs over us so  
 stupendous, it would be absurd to imagine, that  
 we could preserve that commanding importance,  
 in which we have so long stood, in the scale of  
 nations, by a supine indifference to continental  
 affairs: that our interest could induce us to pull  
 up the draw-bridge, and remain enclosed in our  
 little but impregnable fortrefs. Either the whole  
 line of policy which this country has invariably  
 pursued since the reign of the immortal Wil-  
 liam, has been one complete system of error;  
 either the grand alliance which he formed to  
 curb the ambition of a powerful despot, (which,  
 I believe, no one will venture to condemn,)  
 and to preserve Europe from his mighty  
 grasp, and which saved Holland; was the off-  
 spring of crooked and short-sighted policy, or  
 Great Britain must hold the scales of European  
 power. If the danger, in which that illustrious  
 statesman found himself involved, justified that  
 conduct,

conduct, that unparalleled immensity of peril, by which we are now environed, must, surely, be a far greater justification of it. Now that France has wrought a mine which is to blow up, at one grand explosion, the whole fabric of civilized society, inevitable destruction must be the consequence of our indifference and torpor. Experience has proved what glorious advantages a well-timed and spirited alliance *can* produce. A more recent experience has shewn us what fatal calamities an alliance of a contrary nature *must* generate. The only alternative, then from general ruin, is a cordial and zealous co-operation. Of the success of this there can be but little doubt.

-li W. Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel *just*.

The confession has been, indeed, recently made by a distinguished statesman—that it is not to be doubted, that sufficient power is possessed by Europe to annihilate, if heartily and wisely employed, the despotism of France. This declaration derives peculiar value from the reflection, that it is the production of a man whose predictions are not usually of a complexion to kindle the zeal of his countrymen. Should it be said, that

that experience has evinced of what little avail opposition must prove, it should be considered, that much greater hopes of success are surely to be expected from the determined exertions of States, convinced of the real designs of their enemy, and conscious of their imminent danger, than from the supine indifference, or passive resistance to an almost unopposed foe. Discordance in design, and laxity in pursuit, strengthened the wily enemy. Harmony in design, and indissoluble firmness and perseverance in pursuit, must subdue him. Cowardly torpor must ruin us; combined and vigorous exertions can alone save us from that destruction which is suspended over our heads by a thread. The absurd conceit may, perhaps, be indulged by some, that the disasters, under which France now struggles, render all fears for the safety of this country groundless. Such a notion, however, is most delusive. The grand object by which she is animated is the destruction of this Empire.—As the plunder which would be the fruit of her success, would enable her to achieve her vast plans of aggrandizement upon the Continent; and the demolition of our Constitution would render that despotism of crimes invulnerable,



table, which cannot (as was candidly confessed  
 by Monge) co-exist with it. To accelerate the  
 attainment of this principal object, the would  
 cheerfully agree even to a degrading peace with  
 her continental enemies. Such a peace, how-  
 ever, would be but momentary: it would be  
 settled by France solely for the leisure it would  
 afford her to combine all her strength for the  
 destruction of Great Britain. This would fur-  
 nish her with the means and opportunity of  
 falling upon the Continent of Europe when  
 sleeping in the arms of unsuspicion. The ruin  
 of Great Britain must produce the subjugation  
 of the Continent: The subjugation of the Con-  
 tinent must cause the ruin of Great Britain.  
 —The danger is reciprocal. Nothing but a  
 general co-operation can crush a faction which  
 threatens the independence of civilized Europe.  
 This alone can annihilate an "armed doctrine,"  
 which, with uniform and inflexible persever-  
 ance, aims at the subversion of Christendom;  
 and which has  
 With ambitious aims  
 Against the throne and monarchy of God  
 Rais'd impious war.

It must, indeed, be confessed that the happy prospect which now dawns upon our cause is such as no speculator, a few months past, could have predicted; and as no man whose breast is warmed by even a particle of patriotism, can now behold without well founded joy. The noble spirit of self-deliverance from the most ignominious slavery, which so long lay hid under the thin ashes of apparent tranquillity, has at length emitted some auspicious sparks, and waits only for a zealous and well timed co-operation to burst out into a magnificent blaze. On the Congress at Rastadt, whose ill-boding proximity threatened with degradation and ruin the whole Commonwealth of Europe, I ever indulged the hope that it might be said—*unconquered*

rem.

rem. The palsied hand which might have signed the death-warrant of the august German Empire, has been suddenly arrested by the glorious exploits of the Austrian army. The will and heroic conduct of the Emperor Paul is above all panegyric. Already has the Turk forgot his enmity with the Russian to punish the perfidy of his wily and pretended friend. Inspired by the example of magnanimous Britain, he has bid his former narrow scheme of policy give way to the noble resolution of lending his assistance in crushing the enemy of every Government. Prussia will, if she consults her true interests, hurl from her presence the fly, \* sanguinary Syeyes, and will forget her less important jealousies to escape the chains of systematic Regicides. Every thing, indeed, augurs a prosperous issue to the cause of Europe.

What may be the ultimate end, however, of this unparalleled conflict, as it is hid in the impenetrable womb of futurity, can be subject only of speculation. Whether the civilized world is to be swallowed up by the insatiate jaws of this implacable enemy of peace, and sanguinary destroyer of nations, can be matter only of most

awful

\* Mort sans phrase.



awful conjecture. Thus much, however, is certain, that the *consequence is entirely dependent on the conduct of Europe.* Though I am aware that opinions are clamorously (and by some of our countrymen triumphantly) proclaimed, that France will succeed in her cruel and ambitious designs, still it must be recollected that to assertions, assertions may be opposed. (The example justifies our imitation and palliates our arrogance.) Of the success of a *spirited and indefatigable* co-operation, I may be permitted then to declare, that my conviction is firm. All human predictions are fallible.—*Errare mehercule malim cum Platone.*

Nothing can save us but vigorous exertion, and undaunted valour, united in a spirited determination to pour out all the length of the reins of fierce and commanding war. These, I am conscious, will not be wanting : for upon these alone depends our preservation from the unspeakable horrors of the most polluted servitude. Upon these hangs the existence of the British Empire. Magnanimity will be animated into enthusiastic fervor, and roused to vengeance, by the reflection, that all the wars, in which she  
has

has exerted her energy, have sprung, not from an execrable thirst of cruel ambition and insatiable aggrandizement, but from the heroic principles of justice and virtue united for the resentment of unprovoked aggressions. Their characteristic description may justly be given (and of none is it so faithful as of the present) by every man to his injured and insulted countrymen in the words of the Roman Historian—*Certe quidem vos estis Romani, quid estis felicia esse bella vestra, quia iusta sint, praevo-  
bis fertis, non tam exitu eorum quod vincatis,  
quam principis, quod non sine causa suscipi-  
tis GLORIAMINI.*—Livius in Rhodi. Orat.

Nothing can save us but vigorous exertion and undaunted valour, united in a spirited deter-  
mination to pour out all the length of the reins  
of force and commanding war. These, I am  
conscious, will not be wanting: for upon these  
alone depends our preservation from the un-  
speakable horrors of the most polluted servitude.  
Upon these hangs the existence of the British  
Empire. Magnanimity will be animated into  
enthusiastic fervor, and roused to vengeance, by  
the reflection, that all the wars, in which the  
has

FINIS.

*Chauchard's Maps of Germany, Italy, &c.*

On Fourteen large Sheets, Nine Feet by Seven.

*By Subscription will be published,  
Price, to Subscribers, only Three Guineas,*

**A GENERAL MAP**

OF THE

*Empire of Germany, Holland, the Netherlands, Switzer-  
land, the Grisons, and the Northern Part of Italy.*

BY CAPTAIN CHAUCHARD,

Military Engineer to the Count D'Artois.

Published by JOHN STOCKDALE, Piccadilly.

AT the earnest solicitation of some Friends, Mr. STOCKDALE had undertaken the Engraving of CHAUCHARD's incomparable MAP, allowed, by the most competent judges, to be the best Map of those Countries extant. It cannot now be purchased at any Price, and, could it even be procured, the Plates are so extremely worn down, as scarcely to leave the Impression of the words legible, and consequently to render the French copy of no value.

The Work was already in hand, and he intended to have published it in about Fourteen Weeks; but, at the Suggestion of some of the Subscribers, delayed it until he should receive One Hundred Names; which being nearly accomplished, it is proceeding with, and will be published as early as possible.

It may be either preserved on rollers, or in port-folios.

No money is required until the delivery of the Work, but as the expence of Engraving, &c. will be little less than ONE THOUSAND POUNDS, Mr. Stockdale will consider himself obliged by being favoured with the names of such gentlemen as may wish to be possessed of them.

*Piccadilly, May 1799.*

N. B. In consequence of the Royal, Noble, and very liberal Patronage already received, the Publisher has resolved to give, to the Subscribers only, without any additional charge, neatly printed in quarto,

**A GEOGRAPHICAL ACCOUNT**

*Of the Countries described on the above Map.*

*A List of the Subscribers will be printed.*

